DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 032 PS 009 687

TITLE Summaries of the State-of-the-Art Position Papers on Day Care.
INSTITUTION Texas State Dept. of Public Welfare, Austin.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 77
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS After School Day Care; *Certification; Child Care; Child Care Workers; *Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; Elementary School Students; *Federal Regulation; Government Role; Health; Infants; Parent Participation; Physical Environment; *Preschool Children; *Public Policy; Safety; Staff Utilization; *Standards; State Federal Aid; *State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS After School Day Care; *Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements

ABSTRACT

This review consists of summaries of 20 position papers presenting varying viewpoints on aspects of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR). Among the authors represented are Gwen Morgan, Edward Zigler, Greta Fein, Henry Ricciuti, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Jerome Kagan and Elizabeth Prescott. Seven of the position papers deal with legal aspects, administration, and the role of governments in the regulation of day care. Four papers are concerned with the impact of day care on infants and preschoolers. Health, safety and environmental issues in day care were covered in three other papers. The remaining six papers cover staffing issues, school age day care, the impact of FIDCR on families and marketplace issues. (Author/BF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147032

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUMMARIES OF THE STATE—OF—THE—ART POSITION PAPERS ON DAY CARE

JULY 1977

PS 009687

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

AUSTIN, TEXAS

SUMMARIES OF THE STATE-OF-THE-ART POSITION PAPERS ON DAY CARE

Introduction

As part of the Congressionally-mandated FIDCR Appropriateness Study, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW) commissioned the writing of 20 concept papers dealing with some aspect of Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR). An attempt was made to have experts with opposing views develop papers on the same topics. The length of these typewritten papers varied from as little as 15 pages to as many as over 300 pages.

It was felt that summaries of the position papers would be of considerable value for such relevant groups as state and Federal agency personnel, day care providers, professors, policymakers and organizations concerned with day care and child development.

Seven of the position papers deal with legal aspects, administration, and the role of government in the regulation of day care. Four papers are concerned with the impact of day care on infants and preschoolers. Health, safety and environmental issues in day care were covered in three other papers. The remaining six papers cover staffing issues, school age day care, the impact of FIDCR on families and marketplace issues.

Each of the 20 position papers has been reviewed and critiqued by other experts. The authors are being given an opportunity to revise their position papers based upon written critiques. The summaries of position papers printed herein will not have taken into account-revisions that may have been made by authors.

The papers were summarized by various consultants. Drs. William J. Meyer, C. Russell Hill, Charito Kruvant and Ginny Redish had written their own summaries. Those summarizing each paper attempted to portray the views of the original authors, and as such, tried to emphasize those points made by the original writers. No attempt was made to critically review or to impose other's ideas into these summaries. These summaries should not be considered to represent the views or policies of DHEW or the State Department of Public Welfare.

LEGAL ASPECTS OF FEDERAL DAY CARE STANDARDS

By Gwen G. Morgan, Wheelock College

This paper includes an Introduction, a Bibliography and three sections: I Standards, II the Standards and the Law, and III Issues and Options for the Federal Government. It contains 136 pages including a Bibliography of seven pages. (March, 1976).

Introduction

Debate over the federal standards for day care has grown steadily more emotional during the past eight years. Congress has been subjected to extreme pressure from both the operators of child care programs who fear that enforcement of standards will force fees to be too high for non-subsidized families and, on the other hand, from child welfare specialists that standards would open the door to exploitation of poor children by commercial interests.

Congress has mandated an appropriateness of federal standards. This is an effort to assemble more facts in order to make decisions based on reason rather than emotion.

The paper examines the role and purpose of standards, the legal rationale which undergirds them, the relationship of federal standards to state licensing, the enforceability of federal standards, and the possible future directions for the federal government.

The ultimate goal in developing day care policy is to meet the need in our communities for social support to families in their legal obligation to provide quality life to children which enhances their growth. She stresses universally assessible mutilithic program forms, a degree of autonomy for parents and staff, and developmental care. Both public and private services should be regulated for the protection of children from potential future harm and for assuring public accountability for public funds.

I. Standards

Goal standards and legal requirements are often confused. The author feels it is useful to use the word standard with some qualifying adjectives such as "goal standards", "licensing standards", "professional standards", and "funding standards." In communities where there is an accreditation system, there is less confusion, the distinction between permission to operate and the seal of approval becomes clearer. Morgan presents the following chart to illustrate various kinds of standards.

CEILING OF QUALITY		
	Accreditation	Standards of quality for model programs
	Credentialing	Standards spelling out qualifications to be required of staff
Rate Setting	Fiscal Regulation	Funding standards
	Inspection and Approval	Administrative standards for publicly operated programs
Fire and Safety Sanitation Regulations	Day Care Licensing	Basic preventive requirements or standards
FLOOR OF QUALITY		
Operating a day care program without a license is a crime.	Child abuse and neglect	Below an acceptable standard the state punishes as crimes behavior deemed abusive or neglectful.

She distinguishes two different philosophies for establishing the minimum: (1) the minimum level to assure life, health, and safety of a child; or (2) the minimum level to contribute positively to a child's growth.

In the process of standard formulation, two major principles apply: (1) procedural due process, and (2) interest representation.

Due process relates to the ever widening interpretation of the 5th and 14th Amendments of the U. S. Constitution and to the Administrative Procedures Acts of federal and state levels. The government must deal fairly, and in a non-arbitrary way, with citizens affected by its action. Techniques include giving notice, allowing an opportunity to be heard,

giving access to information, rights to appeal, and generally checking undue discretion of the regulatory agency.

The concept of interest representation centers around the procedural due process. In the formulation of standards, the administrative agency needs to include in its deliberations those with an interest in its outcome. Some states spell out advisory committees, for this purpose, with broad representation. Groups that are represented in discussions are more likely to support the resulting standards. Excluded groups may be freer to try to overturn standards during the public hearing process.

Five major groups, with several kinds of representation in each group, should be represented: (1) staff of the administering agency, especially front line licensing staff; (2) professionals or academic experts from national organizations, federal agencies, or the academic field; (3) licensees, including both proprietary and philanthropic auspices, and parent cooperatives; (4) consumers; and (5) the official cooperators such as health, building safety, fire safety, and the Attorney General's office.

Every standard to be enforced needs to be defensible in rational terms. Standards can be defended on four different bases: (1) hard scientific data, (2) expert opinion, (3) common practive, or (4) a consensus among interests represented.

Expertise does not provide the solid base that it once did unless there is a body of scientific knowledge upon which all agree. Since experts can be found on two sides of almost any issue, policymakers cannot rely heavily upon experts. Scientific data in themselves do not produce a standard. They provide the evidence, and the standard must be a value statement or policy which society has agreed to pursue. The requirement of 35 sq. ft. per child is defensible as a common recognized practice even though it would be hard to produce scientific data to indicate a different effect than 50 sq. ft., for example. To use this kind of an argument, federal standards would need a solid consensus and general agreement among providers and advocate groups that a particular standard has been found important for accomplishing a goal for children. Consensus building is even more difficult at the federal level than it is in the states. It is, nonetheless, just as important. Only a fairly solid national consensus can bring about an enforceable set of standards.

History of Day Care Standards in the United States

The first Board of Charity was created by statute in Massachusetts in 1863. A lay group of prominent citizens was appointed by the governor. They were to provide advice to publish an annual report on their visitations and to suggest "standards." Several other states passed similar statutes. During the early days, standards were ideals derived from introspective thought, and monitoring was used without any implication of control.

In 1900 Florence Kelley of the National Consumers League proposed a U. S. Commission for Children. In 1909 the first White House Conference on Care of Dependent Children took place. This conference gave the major impetus to a bill passed in 1912 creating the U. S. Children's Bureau.

At first, licensing was seen as a form of help to operators so that goals of meeting standards would be achieved.

Day care standards entered a new phase in 1962 when the Social Security Amendments made federal money available for day care, but only if licensed by the state. Towards the end of the 1960's a changed public climate of opinion created two serious problems for licensing offices. There was serious public concern for the well-being of children who needed day care and do not have it. Advocacy groups disseminated statistics showing the gap between numbers of working mothers and numbers of spaces in licensed child care programs. Child advocates pushed for high licensing standards, but were hostile to law enforcement. The licensing process itself had become very cumbersome and intolerably time-consuming, especially in large cities.

Head Start was born as a desire to create new institutions, bypassing established structures, particularly state and city governments. Head Start did not initially seek licensing or develop a relationship with licensing staffs in the states. Head Start had its own federal standards and many believed that it was not subject to state licensing.

On December 23, 1967 an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was enacted. Federal agencies were directed to take steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care. Head Start and day care were to be coordinated with a common set of program standards and regulations. The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) of 1968 were published in the **Federal Register** on January 28, 1969.

The action of the Congress (in 1971) in writing standards into the law, and the growing trend toward effective enforcement of licensing standards in the states, means that there is no longer any possibility of hiding behind ambiguities. Advocate groups must examine their underlying assumptions and the government must be clear on its goals. The basic issues which underlie standard setting must be faced in the decade ahead. Unless people of good will can share their concerns and reach a consensus of support for standards, there will be no way in which standards can be enforced. Achievement of standards depends upon public support and a common concern.

In 1970 the White House Forum on Day Care created a Task Force chaired by Dr. Alfred Kahn to consider the delivery of services. The group recommended a policy rather than a program approach, that we should "build on and link up the existing network of services at the community level," rather than duplicating and thereby eliminating the present day care programs.

II Standards and Law

When a government acts to impose standards, it does so from a legal basis. The mandate to regulate must be based on either a statute, the constitution, or some common law doctrine. The FIDCR are not a form of federal licensing. FIDCR do not duplicate or replace that legal process. Those who do not use federal funds are free from any relationship from the federal government through FIDCR.

Since the FIDCR apply only to children in certain federally funded programs, FIDCR are not an upholding of children's right to quality child care.

Children have a right to parental support under Common Law which is a state, not a federal right. Parental support is the most promising basis to try to extend children's rights to include the right of positive parenting.

FIDCR could be considered a consumer protection for children and families using federal subsidized child care as they remain eligible.

For the Federal government to assume a protective role on behalf of children in day care, it would have to assume that parents will not, or cannot, make such an intervention themselves.

The FIDCR could be seen as a federal protection of children in day care against potential harmful conditions, neglect and abuse created by inferior day care, rather than an intervention into the family.

The sanctions which back up FIDCR are the withholding or withdrawing of federal funds, unlike the sanctions in a licensing or protective or rights enforcing legal action. Using this purchasing power, the federal government insisted on a level of quality sufficient for the ac-

complishment of its goals.

FIDCR are clearly not licensing, and they are clearly not federal protective intervention. Technically they are funding specifications to accomplish the goals of Title XX, and appear to reflect a desire on the part of Congress to establish and describe the kind of quality of care which children have a right to expect when federal policy encouraged their mothers to work, with some treatment goals added.

In exerting its power, a public administrative body may adopt or make only such rules and regulations as are necessary and reasonable, and it may not act arbitrarily.

An administrative agency may be challenged legally if it develops rules and regulations without full public hearing and without the opportunity for interested parties to be heard. This is particularly true when the rules have the effect of rate setting as does the staff-child ratios in FIDCR.

A question has been raised as to the clear effect of FIDCR on their effect on costs and the rate-setting effect which this has. It could be argued that the expense of the service curtails the number of children who can be served under the appropriations, and, therefore, defeats the intention of the Congress.

It is conceivable that a parent of a child in day care, who is not receiving any federal reimbursement, could take action on the grounds that the effect of FIDCR on the rate paid by private fee paying parents in the same program results in unreasonable costs. This deprives the child of the right of life, liberty and property since the day care is necessary to enable employment.

Improper delegation of authority by Congress, failure to hear interested parties, going beyond Congressional intent, and effects on rates, were the possible areas of legal challenge to FIDCR during the period of 1968 - 1972 when FIDCR were administrative regulations. If there had been an opportunity to challenge the FIDCR on the basis that Congress did not prescribe sufficient standards, the 1972 Social Security Amendments closed that door. Now the only legal challenge could be on specific interpretations and applications of the standards.

As FIDCR become enforced, those affected could challenge the enforcers in the courts if their actions appear to be unfair. The day care operators in five southern states brought the issue of child-staff ratios before a federal district court and won a delay in implementation. The possible grounds for such suits include: (1) failure of a particular standard to meet constitutional tests of clarity, practicality, or greater goodness; (2) selective or discriminatory enforcement; and (3) arbitrary or capricious use of discretion, the effect of a particular standard operating as rate setting.

In the test of clarity, the man in the street should know what is expected of him; In the test of practicality, there must be a reasonable possibility that the rul can be met. In the test of greater goodness, the rule must not generate greater evil than the good it seeks to accomplish. A challenger to this rule would need a very strong case. Regulations issued by an agency in rule making must stand unless they are deemed irrational, arbitrary or capricious.

Selective enforcement could be argued to be an injustice. The power to be lenient is the other side of the coin of the power to coerce unfairly. Selective enforcement is seldom disapproved in the court unless discriminations against some group can be proved. Discriminatory enforcement is seldom disapproved in the court unless discriminations against some group can be proved. Discriminatory enforcement would be related to the Civil Rights Act and other similar legislation.

Certain standards affect costs more than others. Since 80% of the day care budget is often spent for staff, the per child cost is very closely related to the child-staff ratio which is required. If the person responsible for enforcement acts outside the limits of the standards, going beyond the scope of his or her authority, a suit can be brought.

There are special enforcement issues in family day care. Legal issues in family day care may surface first because of its private nature. Commonly a licensee's refusal to permit inspection is given as a statutory cause for license revocation. FIDCR does not have such legal language backing up inspection. Questions have been raised about whether these broad investigative powers are constitutional.

The FIDCR is discussed in detail. The FIDCR role in relation to state licensing is also discussed. A critique is made of **Guides to Day Care Licensing.**

III Issues and Options for the Federal Government

FIDCR are a strategy for achieving a level of quality across the nation when children are in federally funded day care. While it seems clear that the strategy has resulted in a higher level of quality than would have been the case without FIDCR, it is also clear that there has been massive slippage in implementation. There has been confusion and controversy surrounding the strategy. A successful strategy for the next five years will be arrived at through balancing through different kinds of factors: (1) the sources available to the federal government for implementation of the strategy, (2) the variety of external factors either undermining or enhancing the strategy, and (3) the values and goals of the various parties to the strategizing. Policymaking combines what you can do, what you might do, and what you want to do.

Effective implementation of FIDCR depends upon an effective inspection process. HEW does not have the staff to monitor and evaluate FIDCR through federal inspection. Three options are presented: (1) employ at least 100 new inspectors, (2) make more requirements on the state staff and purchase of service and program development units, or (3) make use of the state licensing staffs. While none of these options is the perfect solution, the third could have the greatest potential for children. If the implementation of the FIDCR could combine with the implementation of state licensing rather than over-lapping with it, the result could be more effective use of scarce resources.

Another issue in standard enforcement is the resource available to the day care services for meeting the standards. The government will not be effective in implementation of the FIDCR if it pays programs so little that they cannot possible meet the standards.

Some of the external factors which have tended to diminish the effective enforcement of FIDCR are the following: (1) there has been confusion over what FIDCR are and how they relate to state licensing, (2) the temper of the times appears to be anti-bureaucracy and anti-regulation, (3) the hard data knowledge base on which to justify standards does not exist in the same sense in which it is available for physical planning, (4) bureaucratic apathy also undermines the effectiveness of the standards, (5) the nature of the legal process further hampers the effectiveness of the regulatory process, (6) the use of political influence on the part of the regulated further reinforce bureaucratic passivity and apathy, (7) the current desire for cost cutting at both the federal and state levels does not create a climate conducive to effective inspection, (8) the fragmentation of agency responsibility is a further undermining factor, (9) the lack of operators able and willing to meet requirements is still a further problem affecting the effectiveness of FIDCR.

Four options for the federal government might be examined: (1) deregulate day care at the federal level, (2) accept the status quo as the best which can be achieved under the circumstance, (3) commit more federal resources to making FIDCR work, (4) use the need for FIDCR enforcement as a lever to make the entire regulatory system work better. The fourth option is most worth considering because it is possible that, with a reasonable use of federal resources, improvements could be made in the entire regulatory system which would benefit children. The following recommendations are based upon an analysis of implementation of this fourth option.

Recommendations

1. First, it is strongly and untentatively recommended that the federal government should not attempt to dictate what state licensing standards should be.

2. Tentatively, it is recommended that there should be established in each state, as part of the Title XX planning, a process for deciding what the funding standards should be in that state.

3. The version of the FIDCR used by UNCO is much clearer than the original document.

4. The compensatory staff-child ratio of the FIDCR would be recommended for programs serving children who are disadvantaged and for untrained staff. The basic ratio could be the one described in "Guides", while the compensatory one could be the one in the present FIDCR.

5. There are compelling reasons against there being a federal "safety net" of standards.

6. It needs to be clear that funding standards are indeed to be funded.

7. HEW should require states to link their rate setting and reimbursement process with the inspection and quality control process.

8. The federal government should use the existing state licensing staff for monitoring FIDCR and should contract for this service.

9. The important role of the federal government in the next decade could be carried out through assuming responsibility for the ongoing training of state licensing staffs.

10. Through public education, the federal government could also stimulate greater use of licensing by the public to secure its rights much as Civil Rights legislation has been used.

11. There should be a person identified in HEW who is responsible for technical assistance to all the citizens' groups in the development of standards.

12. The fragmentation in regulation should be reduced and, where possible, eliminated.

13. The federal government might experiment with opening up the monitoring process to include assistance by voluntary consumer groups.

14. The regulatory process should go public (disseminate inspection reports to the press and interested groups), to discourage passivity on the part of regulatory agencies.

15. HEW should disseminate information and encourage conferences designed to encourage consensus building in the direction of coherent national policy for child care in the future.

Quality child care is within the reach of this country if we can separate it from repressive economic policies and develop a consensus for appropriate goals, - - offering our support to the American family in its child rearing responsibilities in assurance of children's rights.

ALTERNATIVES TO FIDCR: THE FEASIBILITY OF STATE STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION OF FEDERALLY-SUPPORTED DAY CARE

by
Richard R. Rowe, Ph. D.
American Institutes for Research, Cambridge, Mass.

This position paper, composed of 35 pages, includes an introduction and sections on Background, Major Policy Issues, Possibilities and Problems in Certification Standards, Costs and Summary. (December, 1976)

Introduction

This paper discusses some alternatives to the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR). One alternative is the feasibility of developing state standards for certification of federally supported day care. It examines some of the implications of state certification and explores the manner in which such a system could function should it become federal policy to move in that direction.

I. Background

In September of 1968 the FIDCR were approved by federal agencies as a common set of standards to be used in regulating day care programs supported by these agencies.

Reactions to the FIDCR were mixed. Some experts and advocates were enthusiastic. Some day care providers were critical and complained of the cost implications. Congress did not provide funding to support existing day care at the level of the FIDCR standards. Few states approached adequate implementation of their own licensing standards. They were not in a position to require FIDCR.

The administration never seriously attempted to implement the FIDCR standards. At best they functioned as goals to be achieved at some future time.

Most states acknowledge being substantially out of compliance with FIDCR. It would require a considerable amount of money to meet FIDCR staff-child ratios for children in federally funded day care. In 1975 the FIDCR, with some modification, became part of the Title XX legislation. These standards became law in February of 1976. In September, PL94-401 deferred the FIDCR staffing requirements until 1 October 1977, and provided an additional $200 million for day care.

If FIDCR staffing standards are retained and enforced, additional federal funds would be required to prevent widespread closing of day care centers throughout the country.

If the FIDCR were revised, three major options would merit consideration: (1) reduce the minimum staff-child ratios required by FIDCR, (2) develop a set of guidelines to be used by states in the development of their own certification standards, (3) require only that state licensing standards apply to programs receiving federal funds. This paper focuses on the second of these three alternatives to FIDCR.

II. Major Policy Issues

A. **Criteria for evaluation options.**

Some of the factors which seem relevant to the evaluation of standards are listed below:

1. **Consumer considerations**
   - Responsiveness to individual parent needs and priorities;
   - Responsiveness to needs of individual children serviced;

- Effect upon the market - - i.e., supply and demand for day care;
- Support from the general public;
- Responsiveness to local conditions;
- Responsiveness to changing conditions over time.

2. **Administrative considerations**
   - Simplicity;
   - Support by state and federal administrators;
   - Accountability;
   - Resistance to corruption;
   - Probability of enforcement;
   - Credibility of sanctions;
   - Ability to penalize with target efficiency.
3. **Financial considerations**
   - Unit cost of care;
   - Total federal cost;
   - Cost/Effectiveness of services.
4. **Legislative and legal considerations**
   - Consistency with legislative intent;
   - Assurance of open and due process;
   - Protection of minorities;
   - Consistency with federal and state constitutional roles.

These criteria should be kept in mind in evaluating the various policy options for federal day care regulation.

B. Federal Goals

Questions central to the federal issue concern what combination of quality and quantity of day care is the federal government prepared to support. Congress seems to be impressed with both the high cost of quality care and with the importance of the early childhood years.

Many child welfare advocates are concerned with any changes in the FIDCR that would decentralize such standards. They claim that any such movement would lower the quality of federally supported day care. Although FIDCR are expensive, mainly because of the minimum staff to child ratios, their relation to quality is not clear. FIDCR do not deal with such matters as quality of director, staff morale and turnover, and parent involvement, which is supposedly highly related to quality of day care.

FIDCR apply to a small percentage of the toal supply of day care provided in centers and homes throughout the country. Thorough implementation of FIDCR could have the effect of separating poor federally supported children from other children.

Policy concerning standards must also take into account available funding. If the present FIDCR were enforced, an increase in federal day care funds would be necessary.

Federal goals for day care are not clear. The complex issues involved interact with other federal policies and will not be easily resolved.

C. The Roles of Standards

Four different kinds of standards applicable to children are defined as follows: (1) Abuse standard. All states have standards which define those behaviors towards children which are prohibited. They apply to parents as well as to everyone else. (2) Licensing standards. Licensing standards define the minimum conditions under which a service can be offered to the public for compensation. They apply to both profit and non-profit facilities. (3) Purchasing standard. A purchasing or funding standard is a standard any purchaser of a service such as day care applies as a conditon of funding a service. The FIDCR are an example of a purchesing standard. (4) Model standard. Model standards represent an optimal quality of service. A model standard may be established by government or private organizations. Too great an emphasis on purchasing standards can have a depressing effect on the development of quality day care.

D. Legal Status of Federal Regulations

Reference is made to position paper by Gwen Morgan on **Legal Aspects of Day Care Standards.** The federal proportion of support for day care is sufficiently large to justify enforcement of federal standards. On the other hand, it is generally considered unconstitutional to impose federal standards on day care programs which are not federally funded. Licensing is a police function which is the exclusive province of the states.

E. State Role of Day Care Regulation

Historically the states are responsible for regulating day care services through the licensing process. States are also responsible for implementing the federal purchasing standard, FIDCR. There are arguments for and against an increased state role in day care regulation.

F. Education, the Schools and Day Care

Educators are showing an increasing interest in the area of early childhood education and day care for a number of reasons. Some public schools have initiated programs which include infants. Federal day care regulation generally is not applied to public schools.

III. Certification Standards: Possibilities and Problems

Certification standards refer to standards developed by each state according to federal guidelines and apply to all federally supported day care in that state. Licensing standards refer to standards developed by a state which apply to all organized day care in a state.

A. Possible Procedures for Establishing Certification Standards

Federal guidelines would specify federal day care goals. Each state would be required to develop its own standards for federally supported day care.

1. Federal Day Care Goals

States would have the responsibility for establishing appropriate certification standards in the development and articulation of federal day care goals.

2. Interest Participation

Federal guidelines would require certification standards be developed on the part of representatives from those groups that are most affected by the standards. Participation would include parent/consumer groups, public and private providers, child development and children's advocates, state officials responsible for day care licensing and policy, and state legislators responsible for day care policy and financing.

3. Administrative Accountability

Responsibility for promulgating of standards would be with the state agency responsible for day care licensing standards.

4. Open Process

The development of standards should be an open public process. Hearings could be held throughout the state in order to ensure broad public discussion and public participation in the development of standards.

5. Dissemination of Standards

The standards which are finally developed, together with a rationale for those standards, should be broadly disseminated throughout the state.

6. Periodic Review

Certification standards would be formally reviewed at least every four years.

B. Content of Certification Standards

Guidelines would indicate what elements are required in a certification standard. These should include: (1) state day care goals; (2) specific standards such as health and safety requirements, staff ratios, inservice training and record keeping; (3) federal approval; (4) minimum standards, and (5) family day care standards.

C. Implementation of Certification Standards

Federal guidelines would specify minimum standards for effective state implementation and monitoring of certification standards. These would include: (1) staff, (2) program support, (3) program audit system and record maintenance, and (4) federal support.

D. The Federal Role

The federal role would specify: (1) day care policy and funding, (2) financial support for certification process, and (3) federal monitoring.

IV. Costs

A framework is provided for estimating the costs of the state certification procedures discussed here.

A. The Cost of Day Care

The cost implications of the staff-child ratios in the FIDCR is considered the major barrier to its being implemented. There are honest differences of opinion about the impact of reducing staff-child ratios upon the quality of care.

B. Cost of Developing Certification Standards

It is expected it would require one year to develop appropriate licensing standards in each state. The author estimates the direct costs to develop such standards should not exceed an average of $50,000 per state.

C. Cost of Monitoring and Compliance with State Certification Standards

Most states would require further training and upgrading of staff for monitoring standards with an additional $200,000 per state for average cost of federal monitoring.

D. Cost of Federal Monitoring

The author makes a rough estimate of $15.5 million dollars for initial year of federal monitoring, and $11.5 million dollars each additional year.

V. Summary

A process of state certification of federally supported day care is technically feasible and not prohibitively expensive.

State certification would probably lead to standards which, on the average, require less cost per child. State standards would probably legitimize the kind of care now being purchased with federal funds. The proposed system would involve the federal government working more closely with state day care systems.

A state certification system might be seen by many as a retreat from the previous federal policy of insisting upon uniform high standards for day care. It might also be seen as a denial of the equal rights each child has to an optimal environment in which to grow.

The cost implications of the FIDCR staff-child ratio serve to limit the availability of day care to a small percentage of poor children who need good day care. Any serious implementation of the FIDCR would exclude many poor children from day care. The author feels that we should not let differences over the issues of standards become divisive and divert attention and energy from the overriding need for expanded support for poor and near poor families with children.

HISTORY OF THE FEDERAL INTERAGENCY DAY CARE REQUIREMENTS

by
Sara Pope Cooper
Alexandria, Va.

Included in this paper are sections on Introduction, History and Background, Development of the Mandate, Developing the FIDCR, State Licensing Codes, 1972 Revisions of the FIDCR, Enactment of Title XX, and Aftermath.

The paper is a synthesis of available documents, surviving files, and personal interviews. It contains 54 pages plus 2 pages of footnotes.

Introduction

Day care in the United States has been the subject of persistent and sometimes bitter dispute for more than 100 years. Gradually the need for day care for children of working mothers has pulled government officials, child development specialists, educators, and others into a controversy over conflicting national values and difficult social policy questions.

Adoption of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirement (FIDCR), in 1968, together with other developments about the same time, mark a significant stage in the development of national social policy on day care. This brought about the acceptance of the working mother as a social norm. There was a clear implication that the entire nation has an interest in the well-being of all children. The government, through the development of appropriate standards, can influence the development of day care programs to keep children safe, happy, healthy, and contribute to their educational and social growth.

History and Background

In 1828, Bostonians drafted a constitution for an infant school. Women were already beginning to work in New England's shops and mills. Bostonians recognized that such a school would be of eminent service to both the parents and children.

Thousands of day nurseries sprang up during the latter part of the 19th and early part of the 20th centuries. They were responding to highly visible consequences of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. The concern was for providing safe, clean, and decent care for children for a society that seemed rapidly to be abandoning its simple agrarian past and a tight circle of hearth, home, and motherhood.

The day nursery movement gained strength under private and philanthropic sponsorship by the turn of the century. It had also begun to develop its critics. The enormous disparity in quality of care stimulated the push for improvement and the protection of children against actual or potential harm. This was viewed as the embryo of the movement for government standards. More powerful was the opposition, the resistance to day care among those who saw it as a threat to family ties and what they thought should be the American norm: mother at home caring for her own children. There was also the fear that if more women were able to work, they would compete with men for jobs and might drive down wages for all.

The kindergarten movement in the 19th century, begun by Fredrich Froebel, suggested that questions of poverty, welfare, and family pathology aside, children might actually benefit from certain kinds of preschool social experience and training outside the home. If kindergarten were good for children of relatively affluent families that initially supported it, it appeared that it might also benefit the less fortunate even more. Maria Montessori's work with impoverished children in Italy was cited as evidence.

The federal government's initial support of day care was based upon practical and immediate realities rather than any convictions about underlying theoretical arguments. The first federal venture came in 1933 in connection with the Works Project Administration during the depression. Day care was envisioned primarily to create jobs for unemployed teachers, nurses, and related personnel. Centers were often run in conjunction with public schools or social agencies. By 1942 improvement in the nation's economy had reduced the number of

families eligible to use the centers, and enrollment had dwindled sharply.

The federal government's second venture into day care was by way of the Lanham Act of 1941. Many of the centers supported under this act were slightly altered extensions of the WPA units. Washington's rationale had neither to do with the creation of jobs nor the provision of day care as a normal service of government. The Community Service Act, or the Lanham Act, was a piece of emergency legislation for the United States mobilization effort for World War II. It enabled women to replace men in vital industries. By the war's end, more than a million children were being cared for in various programs. Few of the Lanham centers survived when Congress declined to continue federal funding in peacetime. It was assumed that the United States would return to its normal pattern: men working outside the home, women working in it. Although the number of women in the labor force would decline slightly in the late 1940's and early 1950's, by 1955 the number of working women increased to almost 20.6 million, accounting for more than 30% of the total U.S. labor force, and more than 1 million above the wartime peak. The percentage of women in the work force has steadily increased since that time. The full implications of the phenomenon as far as day care is concerned were not recognized by the government for some years, however.

Beginning with the amendments to the Social Security Act in 1962, the duality of the federal government's role became more nearly explicit: the first was that day care should be provided in response to a broad social need springing from new realities in American life; second, that day care was a necessary supportive service for adults seeking to escape the cycle of poverty. The amendment required day care plans and cooperation between state agencies to provide necessary health services and education for children in day care, and the establishment of state advisory committees. Care was to be provided in facilities meeting state licensing standards. This was the first explicit federal effort to require minimum standards for day care. Some individuals estimated that as much as 40% of the funds appropriated under this act were actually spent on licensing efforts. The day care legislation in 1964 tied more directly to the war on poverty and was similarly limited. Yet both of these were significant elements in the background of the FIDCR.

Development of the Mandate

In President Johnson's war on poverty he greatly elaborated the Kennedy administration's efforts to break the cycle of hard core and multi-generated poverty. Day care was once again seen as an instrument of adult employment policy--an auxilliary service to be provided as efficiently and inexpensively as was decently possible. Johnson's administration emphasized job training and increased employment for the poor.

The Head Start programs, initiated under the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, had widespread political and professional support for the ideal that supportive, compensatory and remedial aid should be given to children for their own sake. Federal intervention might come too late for adults, but it could change the prospects for children. The Senate variation of the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act declared that one of the major unresolved problems of the poverty program was the lack of sufficient coordination among the wide variety of programs which served the poor.

Legislation containing a mandate for the FIDCR was Public Law 90-222 signed by President Johnson on December 23, 1967. The day care provisions of this act were relatively small, but the text of the provisions themselves, and the intent of Congress, were clear. Day care was to be a tool for increasing adult employment and thus reducing welfare costs. In addition, Title V, as amended, specified that federally funded day care centers were to provide health, education, social and such other supportive services as may be needed. The Director of Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare had the mandate to develop a common set of program standards and regulations and mechanisms for coordiination at the state and local levels.

As early as 1958 a Children's Bureau study gave a statistically detailed picture of the realities of day care. A second study in 1965 showed that the percentage of children of working mothers cared for outside the children's home, was beginning to increase even though in-home arrangements continued to predominate.

Developing the FIDCR

Under the leadership of Dr. Jule Sugarman, a special interdepartmental interagency panel in 1968 developed standards and mechanisms for coordination of day care programs mandated by the 1967 amendments. Thus the Federal Panel of Early Childhood deliberated and developed their first set of federal standards.

The president's Bureau of Budget, though it was not formerly part of the group, generally opposed requirements that tended to raise the cost of day care. Strong consensus was reached on most points of the FIDCR with remarkable ease. The Labor Department played an active role in deliberations with Mary Keyserling, its Woman's Bureau Chief, presenting strong support for quality day care. The drafters had to work without the aid of any system for monitoring or scientifically testing day care methods then in use. The standards that evolved were very similar to those standards that had existed for Head Start. Sugarman's intentions were that the FIDCR would be goal standards rather than rigid rules comparable to highway traffic laws. It was intended that the FIDCR be modified from time to time as experience demanded. Some of the wording in the standards was deliberately made vague. There was no intention of writing iron-clad requirements to operate widely different programs under different circumstances in different parts of the country, and serving significantly diverse populations of children and parents.

During the spring and early summer of 1968, members of the FIDCR panel and its sub-committees considered standards on many facets of day care. Five aspects were particularly significant: child-staff ratios, parent participation, mental and physical health service, delivery mechanisms and costs. Debate on the needs and trade-offs involved in various issues was extensive, according to the participants.

There was considerable discussion about whether it would be better for the federal government to deal directly with local day care providers, as was being done in the Head Start programs, or instead, work through the state agencies. It was decided that a single state agency should be used. At this time it was not considered appropriate to constrict the nature and quality of the FIDCR at this stage for reasons of economy.

When the first draft of the FIDCR was completed, it was widely distributed for comment and suggestions. State officials, field workers, parent and welfare recipient organizations, advocacy groups, and nonprofit facilities, and all relevant agencies in the federal government were consulted. The final draft that was published was not considered very different from the first by at least some groups.

State Licensing Codes

When the FIDCR were completed in September 1968, the Office of Child Development specialists turned their attention to state licensing code. This work was continued and expanded under the direction of Dr. Edward Zigler who became Director of OCD in June 1970. Licensing codes from the beginning were conceived as vehicles for establishing minimum levels of care that providers must maintain in order to assure the physical and mental protection of all children in American societies. They were not meant to describe society's goals, nor to assure high quality care. They were considered a safety net, an assertion of codes below

which the community would not permit children to be subjected, whether in public facilities or private facilities.

While state codes in some form or other were virutally universal, some states had codes so strict and elaborate that they raised providers' costs prohibitively. Others had codes so lax that experts considered them wholely inadequate. It was decided that the government should prepare a model which all states would be encouraged to adopt. The earliest work was carried out by Sam Granato, Chief of Day Care Office in OCD, and Edna Hughes, a standards regulations specialist in the Children's Bureau. Due to the efforts of Sam Granato and his staff, Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, asked for a study of state codes. The massive study was carried out by CON SERCO, a Seattle computing firm. This study, which began in the fall of 1970, included an estimated 10,000 persons of all kinds of entities and experts. Those responsible for the project understood that their goal was to design an effective set, and at the same time to remove all unnecessary barriers at the state level to swift expansion of day care services. The difference between the purpose of state licensing code and the purpose of the FIDCR were that the first should apply to all children in all circumstances, while the second was intended to assure particular kinds of treatment for children to whom the federal government had undertaken special additional responsibilities.

The model codes were officially promulgated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare more than a year after the task force had finished its work, on June 29, 1973. The model codes approved by Zigler's office were described by that office as a more practical and workable approach. Nonetheless, there was much controversy and bitterness by advocates, experts, and providers.

1972 Revisions of the FIDCR

For various reasons that turned out to be less than totally compatible, a number of individuals, agencies and non-governmental groups became interested in revising the FIDCR in the spring of 1970. As part of the process of developing revisions, a conference at the Arlie House was staged in 1970 to bring together approximately a thousand day care administrators, child development specialists, parents, and others interested in day care. Zigler stressed that he wanted to include guidelines on delivery of such things as infant, preschool and school age care. The original drafters of the FIDCR had omitted infant care since they felt that infants should not be entrusted to day care centers. Child-staff ratios again became a bone of contention. Zigler and his staff were concerned that unnecessarily strict standards would drive up costs and reduce the amount of day care available in the nation. During 1972 HEW was proposing day care based on expenditures of about $1,600 per child, while the Office of Management and Budget were wanting to limit this to $800 per child. This was probably the beginning of the battle. After considerable controversy, the proposed 1972 revised FIDCR were sent to the Office of Management and Budget. There they were buried rather than sent to Congress.

Enactment of Title XX

Enactment of legislation adding Title XX to the Social Security Act in 1974 represented a decision to break the deadlock and to move forward again even though most of the important conflicts remained unresolved, and neither side was strong enough to prevail. Title XX was a compromise. For the first time in a federal statute, compliance with the FIDCR was made an absolute condition for receipt of federal aid by day care centers. Title XX became law on June 1, 1975, and the deadline for compliance or loss of funds was 1 October, 1975. Title XX made some changes in terms of ratios for school age children. It also made educational services advisory rather than mandatory. Title XX also gave the Secretary of HEW certain power to modify the FIDCR. It also mandated an appropriateness study of the FIDCR.

The Congress later changed the timetable for enforcement of certain aspects of the FIDCR until 1977.

Aftermath

Passage of Title XX created a period of respite from the public maneuvering and struggle over the FIDCR. The struggle has continued in other forms. Many officials and child care specialists in HEW read the appropriateness study as another opportunity to inject what they consider realistic constraints and modifications into federal day care programs. The mistrust of the motives underlying the appropriateness study has lead some advocacy groups to withhold cooperation from at least some parts of the project. It is expected that they will attempt to influence the reception of the report in Congress.

A CONCEPTUAL STATEMENT ON THE ENFORCEMENT OF CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO REVOCATION

by Norris E. Class, Professor Emeritus, University of Southern California, and Roland C. Gerhart, Jr., Director, Vermont Office of Child Development, with the assistance of Rudolf H. Michaels, Administrative Law Judge, California Office of Administrative Hearings, and Walter Wadlington, Professor, University of Virginia Law School.

The text of the report (67 pages) and the four appendices comprise 112 pages. The text consists of 7 sections dealing with: Child day care - - a new social institution; safe-guarding day care as a regulatory challenge; an operational definition of enforcement of licensing standards; regulatory supervision as positive enforcement of standards; denial and non-renewal as negative enforcement of standards; revocation as negative enforcement of standards; structure for enforcement; and the political sociology of standards enforcement. (December 1976)

I. Introduction: Child Day Care as a new Social Institution

Child day care represents a change in America in the upbringing of children, especially young children under six years of age. It represents a major shift from almost complete reliance on the child's biological parents for performing nearly all the essential tasks of child rearing to a system of multiple parenting.

In this new system of child caring, many persons, most of whom are unrelated to and previously unacquainted with the child, participate in the upbringing process. The change is so recent that the effects are as yet undetermined.

Historically, the social causation which might account for the emergence of child day care as a social institution in the second half of the twentieth century in America includes the following: (1) The extended family system has declined almost to the point of disappearance. (2) The neighborhood as a mutual aid system has attenuated due to high-level population mobility. (3) The cultural acceptance of divorce has

tended to decrease the permanency of marriage and the stability of the home. (4) The community acceptance of working mothers, propelled in part by welfare policy and reenforced, perhaps, by the women's liberation movement, necessitates an ever-increasing amount of day care service.

II. The Safeguarding of Child Day Care as a Regulatory Challenge

By 1920, almost all states had some type of child care licensing although there were great variations as to what was regulated. Only after 1940, a second World War causing women, including mothers, to work away from the home in great numbers, would child day care be recognized as a new social institution in need of serious consideration in respect to policy formulation both as to program and regulation.

The net result was that with little or no public discussion the policy decision was made to "jam" child day care safeguarding into the existing mold of twenty-four hour child care regulatory adminsitration.

The function of day care is fundamentally different from twenty-four hour care. Instead of seeing it as substitute parental care, it is regarded only as a supplementary and/or complementary care service, that is, as an extension of the parent's own care and responsibility.

A second reason why it may have been unfortunate to combine child day care licensing with existing twenty-four hour foster child care licensing is that the latter licensure operation was usually located administratively in state public welfare departments. Public welfare, rightly or wrongly, has the image of being concerned with relief and extremely serious problems of dependency and rehabilitation, it is oriented to "social pathology."

Before arriving at a definitve conclusion as to the best administrative location of public child day care services (including regulatory programs) in any given state, a number of factors - - historic, economic and coordinative - - need be considered. Certainly in any decision-making as to where best to administratively locate day care responsibilities special attention should be given to the feasibility of establishing a separate and independent state office of child development. Such an office of child development would, of course, be multi-functioned - - carrying among other responsibilities those of implementing community organization programs for child development, possibly the operation of child development community clinics or parents' consultation service, and possibly the licensing and accreditation of child development personnel.

III. Enforcement of Child Day Care Licensing Standards: An Operational Definition

Licensing standards may be operationally defined as the various requirements which must be met before official approval to operate is granted and which after approval must be contiually met lest there be a formal termination of the permission to operate. Applied to child day care, licensing standards or requirements represent community expectations of performance where a person engages in one of the several forms of caring for a child in the absence of the parent for part of the day, either away from the home or in the home.

Regardless of the type of care, center or family, the standards will tend to cluster into areas of: (1) programming and staffing requirements, (2) health and sanitation requirements, and (3) fire and other safety requirements.

Section 6b of the "Model State Day Care Licensing Act" in **Guides for Day Care Licensing**, published by the HEW Office of Child Development, provides well stated guidelines for formulating child day care standards.

The gains of statutory guidelines for standards are at least two-fold: (1) They are administratively directive, resulting in the intent of the legislature being conveyed to the licensing agency; (2) knowing the clear intent of the legislature and the areas within which they are authorized to act should be conducive to staff security and confidence. The latter is a most important factor in positive administration of licensing standards enforcement.

As used in child day care regulatory administration the operational goal of licensing standards enforcement is a three-step adminstrative activity: (1) to refuse applicants permission to operate when the regulatory investigation determines a failure to conform to provisions of the statute or standard: (2) to terminate (temporarily in the form of suspension or permanently in the form or revocation) a previously granted approval when regulatory investigation or inspection determines failure to conform to the statute or standards; (3) to suppress illegal activity, viz. operating without a valid license.

IV. Positive Enforcement of Standards

Positive enforcement of standards as indicated in post-license issuance activity concerned with continued compliance by the licensee. Often this activity is referred to as "supervision" although in the licensing statute it is usually designated as investigation and/or inspection. The rationale for supervision in a field such as child day care is two-fold: (1) It aims to safeguard care after issuance of the license. (2) It endeavors to achieve a certain "operational equity."

Analyzed as an operational task, skillful observation can be broken down into four elements: (1) Conceptual clarity of standards in which the licensing worker, making a supervisory visit, understands the concept of each of the licensing standards. (2) Perceptual basis, such as in documenting non-conformity. (It would not be enough to say the food was bad; rather it should be noted that it looked spoiled or smelled bad.) (3) Particularization of focus, which relates to the need to perceive the specific relevant details such as measuable inadequate play space. (4) Standard grading, which is a determination of conformity or non-conformity in regards to each standard.

V. Negative Enforcement of Standards: Denial and Nonrenewal

Denial is refusal by the regulatory agency to approve an applicant permission to operate. Generally there is provision for denial in the licensing statute.

At the point of application, the would be licensee has, in effect, full responsibility for establishing his or her eligibility for the license, but does not as yet have a "property right." After the license has been issued, there is an assumption that licensees have an immediate vested interest or property right. There the regulatory agency has the burden of proof in establishing that the license should be terminated or suspended.

Most states limit the duration of a license to one or two years. There is usually a provision relative to the need to apply or reapply prior to a license expiration. There is relatively little legislative direction as to whether or not the renewal of a license is subject to regulatory investigation de novo (brand new application). This produces uncertainty as to the legal standing of the reapplicant. Empirical analysis indicates that present renewal provisions tend to increase paper work, while accomplishing little in safeguarding child day care.

VI. Negative Standards Enforcement Revocation

Revocation means to call back. License revocation is an official

termination of previously granted approval to operate a facility. The basis of termination is a finding of noncompliance with provisions of the licensing statute, licensing agency standards, the rules and regulations, or conditions of the license, or any or all of these. Licensing acts generally contain a specific revocation provision.

Licensing statute revocation acts usually contain a provision regarding the right of the licensee to a formal administrative hearing. Administrative hearings may also be covered in the pertinent state Administrative Procedure Act.

Five topics are considered in relation to revocation: complaint taking, complaint investigation, prerevocation considerations, revocation actions, and appeal to the courts.

Revocation acts may include (1) proceedings following a letter of intent, and (2) the nature of the hearing.

State day care licensing statutes tend to provide for an appeal to the court following an administrative hearing on a revocation. Generally the courts will not entertain litigation until there has been an administrative hearing or some other determination of the licensee's rights within the framework of administrative law.

VII. Structure for Enforcement

Administrative organization for enforcement are considered in relation to (1) administrative location, (2) state-local relations, and (3) integration of regulatory functions. These are considered mainly from the viewpoint of enforcement implications.

Providing adequate and proper child day care services is primarily an administrative responsibility of state governments. This responsibility is shared with local governments and community groups. The basic regulatory safeguarding of child day care must be seen as a primary responsibility of state government. This does not imply that the federal government should not play a secondary or supportive role in achieving effective and efficient enforcement of state child day care regulatory standards. There are three things that the federal government might do in this regard: (1) it can provide an intellectual leadership in the improvement and refinement of enforcement administration, (2) it should provide to state governments, upon request, technical assistance relative to sound enforcement administration in the field of child day care regulation.

VIII. A Postscript of the Political Sociology of Standards Enforcement

The aim of child day care standards enforcement is to see that there is a putting into effect or a maintaining of standards wherever statutorily covered child day care operations take place. In an operation such as child day care regulations, it is safe to assume that most persons wish to give proper care and are potentially capable of giving it. Within the enforcement operation there is a built-in (administrative) adjudication process which can be implemented when the would-be licensee challenges the determination of facts of specific noncompliance. The administrative adjudication service (fair hearing), easily accessible, operates with reasonable promptness and with a certain latitude of informality and flexibility appropriate to the nature of controversy needing to be resolved.

Looking at all this from the viewpoint of the community as a political society, child day care licensing then may be seen as the mediating of conflict between two long-standing sets of rights or claims. The one set of rights or claims are those of the would-be providers to engage in child day care operations with legal approval.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHILD DAY CARE NEEDS AND IMPROVED FEDERAL AND STATE APPROACHES TO DAY CARE STANDARD SETTING AND ENFORCEMENT

Lela B. Costin, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Mary Dublin Keyserling, Consulting Economist, Washington, D.C.; William L. Pierce, Assistant Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America; Walter Wadlington, Professor, School of Law, University of Virginia.

This paper contains seven sections dealing with (1) Child day care needs; (2) Day care facility quality; (3) State regulation of out-of-home child day care; (4) Status of center and family home regulations. (5) Federal responsibility for action; (6) Legality of federal participation in day care regulatory process; (7) Improving state day care regulatory procedures. The paper consists of 71 pages. (March, 1977.)

I. Magnitude of day care needs

The authors cite the need for expansion and improvement of day care services. A March 1977 Department of Labor study showed that there were 5.6 million working mothers of children under six as of March 1976. Employed mothers had an estimated 6.4 million preschool children. The proportion of working mothers with preschool age children nearly tripled between 1950 and 1976. In addition, there were an estimated 400,000 preschool age children of other relatives (not their parents) living in families in which the mother of the household worked. Simgle parent working fathers accounted for an additional 80,000 preschool age children. They cited a need for day care arrangements in 1976 for 7,000,000 preschool age children because parents had employment responsibilities.

They also cited 14,000,000 children of school age (ages 6 through 13) whose mothers were in the labor force. Their sources showed an overall capacity for an estimated 1.7 million children of all ages, as of 1975, of licensed or approved family day care homes, group day care homes, and centers. They estimated an increase of about 50% in the child caring capacities of day care centers between 1972 and 1975. The estimated nearly two and one half fold increase in the capacity of licensed or approved family day care homes represented, in large measure, a transfer from unlicensed to licensed status.

Nearly all day care centers are believed to be licensed or approved, whereas about 95 percent of homes caring for nonrelated children are not licensed or approved.

A study made in 1975, under contract with HEW, estimated that 40 percent of households, with working mothers and children under the age of six, relied on in-home care as their main care arrangement, while 40 percent utilized the homes of others (18 percent those of relatives and 22 percent those of nonrelatives). An additional 10 percent enrolled their preschool children in nursery schools and the remaining 10 percent in group care centers.

II. The problem of day care facility quality.

A national survey conducted by the National Council of Jewish Women in 1970 and 1971, and reported in **Windows on Day Care** by Mary Dublin Keyserling, was cited as a source for indicating day care center and family day care home quality. The basis of the assessment of quality were specific data collected on (1) physical facilities, (2) staff

qualifications, (3) ratios of adults to children, and (4) services rendered. Facilities were classified as "superior", "good", "fair", or "poor", based on a combination of these criteria. Some 7.1% of the centers visited were classified as superior, while 21.7% were classified as poor. Those classified as good and fair were 24.5 and 46.7% respectively.

The authors also cited a HEW field audit to ascertain the degree of compliance of federally funded day care services with federal, state and local child care requirement. During fiscal years 1972 and 1973, visits were made to 450 centers, 50 family day care homes, and 49 in-home care arrangements in nine states. Some 77% of these facilities were found not to be in compliance with state health, safety and sanitation codes. Some 40% failed to meet auditors' interpretation of Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements with respect to child staff ratios.

III. State regulation of out-of-home child day care

Relatively little licensing and standard setting of day care facilities took place before the 1920's. Pennsylvania passed a foster care licensing law in 1885, followed by Massachusetts in 1892.

By 1937, licensing laws for foster homes had been enacted by 37 state legislatures. Today all states have statutory licensing provisions for foster and institutional care of children, although the provisions of the law vary widely in effectiveness.

Licensing of day care programs in the various states developed relatively recently in spite of the fact that child day care services were in existence in United States as early as the 1830's. Some 20 years later a few hospital day care nurseries opened. Philanthropic efforts provided care for children of low income working mothers and neglected children. There was an increase in nurseries during the Civil War years when women went to work in industry. The settlement house movement during 1880 to 1900 gave impetus to the expansion of day nurseries. Private centers began to enter the field.

A National Federation of Day Nurseries, which was established in 1898, expressed concern for poor quality day care. A sizeable expansion of day care services took place during World War I. By 1923 some 23,000 children were cared for in about 600 day care centers. California was the only state that had enacted a law regulating day care prior to this time. Existing facilities during these early days gave care largely to children who came from broken homes. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and later the Works Progress Administration, brought many day care facilities into existence beginning with the depression of the 1930's. The Social Security Act of 1935 also played a role in service expansion by making funds available to states for child welfare services, including day care. Meanwhile standard setting and enforcement of day care regulation was held back by a number of factors. Day care was regarded as welfare service to the poor, and social welfare groups were discouraging mothers from working.

Efforts were made to utilize regulations for foster homes and institutions whenever disturbing day care conditions were revealed.

While day care was growing, there was an even bigger increase in nursery schools and pre-Kindergarten programs. These were additional programs, mainly for children from middle and upper income families. During World War II the enactment of the Lanham Act financed some 3,000 centers which were serving some 160,000 children by mid 1945. The Lanham Act centers were closed in February of 1946 in all states but California and in New York City.

In the 1960's and on into the 1970's, federal financing of day care took place through such programs as Head Start, those under Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act, and those under Model Cities legislation, under the Work Incentive Program, and Title IV of the 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act (later Title XX).

Meanwhile, the Children's Bureau intensified its effort to promote state day care licensing laws. The public was becoming aware of day care service quality, and state and local governments were pressured to improve day care mandatory licensing standards and their enforcement.

What constitued minimum baseline of children's protection under the fire, safety and physical hazards were broadened over the years to also include children's health, cognitive and psycho-social development and parent involvement. A growing number of states began to write provisions with respect to children to staff ratios, group size, and staff requirements.

In 1968 the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) were promulgated to govern services funded by the federal government. To be federally funded, a facility had to be state licensed, or approved as meeting state standards, and to provide educational opportunities by trained staff members, as well as health, nutritional and social services, parental involvement and program evaluation.

A model state licensing act was drafted and endorsed by 35 national child care advocacy organizations affiliated in the Day Care Alliance of the National Council of Orgaizations for Children and Youth.

During 1973 through 1976 many states continued to upgrade standards and improve regulatory processes. By mid 1975 every state and the District of Columbia had laws requiring licensing of day care centers. All but three required the licensing, certification or approval of family day care homes.

IV. The current status of center, family day care and group day home regulations.

The state day care standards are set with respect to minimum or maximum number of enrollees, size of class groups, adult-child ratios, physical structure of facilities, including space, lighting , safety, toilets, wash basins, indoor and outdoor play equipment, reports and records, and code requirements. Some statutes also relate to child health and nutrition, qualification of staff, and program content. Many states set standards for facilities which care for infants, toddlers and handicapped children.

By mid 1975, 38 states and the District of Columbia had licensing standards affecting day care home which covered essentially the same elements as center regulations. Nine additional states had certification or approval requirements.

Licensing authority in 33 jurisdictions resides with the Welfare Department, with 11 states sharing this jurisdiction with Health Departments.

Relatively few states have quality guidelines comparable to those set forth in FIDCR, the Day Care Alliance model, or the HEW sponsored model bills. The authors cite a number of factors that inhibit the upward revision of state and local licensing standards. The major factor is the cost of care conforming to FIDCR and may range for $35 to $60 per week or more per child.

V. Federal responsibility for action

Developmental care should be the birthright of every American child. Developmental care, in or out-of-home, should include understanding childrens' needs and stages of growth, consistent nurture, support of emotional response, attention to child's health and safety progress, and a variety of stimulating experiences which contribute to the child's

cognitive and social development.

To achieve out-of-home care to meet these criteria would necessitate federal legislation for substantial increases in federal grants for improving day care program quality and making enforcement of standards effective.

Acceptable standard care is beyond the means of a large number of families. Legislation should be passed to make day care services available without cost for children in low income families. For children in families with incomes up to moderate levels, fees should be scaled to income. Ultimately it is likely that, in the United States, day care will be recognized as a public responsibility similar to elementary and secondary schooling for all families who wish to benefit. The FIDCR, even though not being enforced, have served as a yardstick to help improve quality of both funded and non-federally funded care. They also helped to bring about understanding of the cost of good care and the necessity for public support. The federal government has responsibilities in the setting of standards. It also has responsibility to assure that its funds to states and localities are effectively utilized. These objectives necessitate continued application of FIDCR. A call is made to re-examine FIDCR from time to time.

Suggested revisions of FIDCR's should involve the widest possible consensus on the part of child advocate groups and other public interest and professional organizations through the convening of a working conference.

The licensing function is recognized as the responsibility of each of the States. Each State should adhere to FIDCR to be eligible for federal day care program funds. Congress should also authorize funds to assist the States in improving and enforcing day care regulations in order to help the States eliminate substandard care, to narrow major differences in State codes, and to assure at least a minimal degree of protection for all children. To be eligible for such assistance, each State should have an acceptable day care licensing plan spelling out the status of day care regulation for that State, showing its strengths and weaknesses, and setting measurable objectives. Continuing eligibility for federal funds should depend on progress toward those goals.

VI. Legality of federal participation in day care regulatory processes.

The federal government has an interest in determining whether its money is being spent effectively. It also has responsibilities with regard to the constitutional rights of those involved. Mention is made of the practical problems involved because of two sets of regulation: FIDCR for services involving federal money, and state regulations in other instances.

Recent court decisions and federal legislative enactments are cited in some detail in defense of the constitutionality and desirability of Federal day care standards, and effective standards enforcement through increased federal-state cooperation, in the interest of protecting the rights of children.

VII. Improving state day care regulatory procedures.

The paper cites the failure on the part of federal, state and local authorities to address problems of licensing processes systematically and consistently. Confusion and conflicting interpretations of requirements are cited as resulting from multiplicity of departments at state and local levels which play a part in facility inspections such as health, fire, sanitation, building codes, personnel, etc. Simplification and more standardized approaches are recommended to ease present difficulties. Interagency committees at state and local levels are recommended to bring about agreement and improvements of regulations and procedures. Since parents have minimal contact with day care licensing personnel and public standards, a simplified version of a manual could acquaint them with standards and licensing appraisal. Periodic parent surveys could provide valuable means of communication and reduce relevancy gaps between parents, operators, and licensers. This would also facilitate parent participation in, and conern for, monitoring. More and better trained licensing staff would improve the regulatory process. Better training and improvement of status and esteem of licensing personnel is important.

Concern is expressed for high turnover of licensing staff. Lack of states is at least in part due to confusion in duties of licensing personnel at different levels of agency organization and lack of clarity about duties and responsibilities. More systematic training of licensing personnel is recommended in such areas as investigative, evaluative and law enforcement aspects of licensing.

Workshops are also recommended for training licensing personnel in areas to include regulatory authority, discretionary justice, "floor of protection", prevention versus protection, constituted and inherent authority, and constructive use of such authority, police power versus parens patriae, licensing standards and their rationale, principles and techniques of observation and evaluation, limits of licensing, systematic steps in the licensing process, the summary judgment, and reasonable compliance.

The need for uniform administration of standards is stressed to assure equal treatment of applicants for licenses. Factors which influence licensing personnel to overlook noncompliance are described.

The need to assure fairness in rule making is essential. Participation in the development of standards needs to include representatives of those who will be required to comply.

Consideration is given to possible alternatives to current licensing approaches. It is contended that deregulation or substitution of registration for licensing would abrogate societal responsibility for child welfare and would, according to surveys cited, be opposed by the majority of operators and parents.

While stating that no defensible case has been made for viable alternatives for the licensing of day care homes, the paper recognizes that the large majority of homes remain outside the licensing system. To speed their inclusion and improve the quality of home service the States and localities should encourage and assist in the satelliting of a network of homes around central service centers. New York City has effectively funded the establishment of such centers. These centers and staff members provide considerable assistance to the day care homes by assisting them in meeting the city's high standards of care and providing monitoring and training, books, toys, equipment, and other services.

The last challenge is that experimentation, demonstration, and evaluation be used to improve the quality of day care.

LICENSING, STANDARDS, AND REGULATIONS IN CHILD CARE PROGRAMS IN EUROPE, CANADA, AND ISRAEL

by
Sheila B. Kamerman, Columbia University
School of Social Work, New York, New York

This paper contains an Introduction, sections on Child Care Systems Models, Day Care in Canada and United Kingdom, one Integrated Child Care System for School Age Children in France, Poland, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Denmark, Yugoslavia, Israel; Conclusions, and Appendices. It consists of 53 pages plus 12 pages of appendices.

Introduction

The report presents comparative data on standards and regulations for child care programs in Europe, Canada, and Israel. Standards refers to rules set by governmental authorities. Licensing means formal permission from government authorities and represents public recognition of having met certain minimum standards.

Most programs in most of the countries mentioned in this paper are funded and operated by public authorities in the same way that public schools are in the United States.

Child care programs are far more extensive in most of Europe and Israel, and possibly in Canada, than they are in the United States. Most countries make a distinction between programs serving very young children such as infants and toddlers under the age of three, and programs serving children age three to compulsory school age, which may be five, six, or seven years of age, depending on the country.

Different standards generally apply to infant and preschool programs. There is also a distinction between center based programs and family day care.

Most industrialized countries in Europe have already taken a clear and consistent position in support of preschool programs for all children from about age three to compulsory school age. More than 90% of children in this age cohort are in such programs in France and Belgium. In the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, close to 2/3 of this age group are in preschool programs.

Child Care System Models

One day care system stresses the "care" function. A second emphasizes the educational function. The third or socialization function may cut across both systems. This has been described as the Anglo-American model, which is prevalent in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada.

Sweden and Finland follow a model, for all preschool age children, in which the major program objectives include care, socialization and education provided in a unified administrative structure.

In two age-related systems, one system is usually for children under the age of three, and stresses the care function, and, increasingly, child socialization and development are included. A second system, for children of three to school age, emphasizes educational goals, with the provision of care and concern for socialization and development. This system is usually administered under educational auspices, while the infant system is usually under either social welfare or health auspices. The preschool model is a popular approach and characterizes, among other countries: Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland, Yugoslavia, and the USSR.

Day Care as One of Two Parellel Systems

In neither Canada or the United Kingdom are organized child care programs very extensive.

In Canada the standard setting and enforcement are either at the provincial or municipal levels. Each of the ten provinces sets its own standards. In addition, the major cities in a province may set standards more stringent than those of the province. Some of the provinces have no or few standards, while others may define them loosely. Compliance and enforcement are generally considered less than complete. Of those provinces having more precise standards, all tend to stress physical standards and safety and hygiene standards. Staffing standards vary substantially among the provinces. For example, staff-child ratios in day care centers vary as follows:

	High	Low
Under age 2	1:2	1:10
age 2 - 3	1:4	1:10
age 2 - 5	1:10	1:15
age 3 - 6	1:6	1:15
age 2 - 7	1:6	1:20

In the United Kingdom the standard setting is at the national level, and enforcement is at the local level. Compulsory schooling begins in England and Wales at age five, and a high proportion of 4-1/2-years-olds already attend school. There is pressure to expand coverage of preschool programs for three and four-year-olds. Current projections are that by 1983 90% of the four-year-olds, and 50% of the three-year-olds will be in either part or full day preschool.

A day nursery or day care center provides all day care for children aged six weeks to five years in defined categories of need, such as children from deprived families or a handicapped child. Centers may be under the auspices of local government or voluntary agencies.

A nursery school or nursery class is a separate educational establishment, or special class attached to a public primary school, for children aged three to five years. It stresses cognitive and social development.

A play group is a part time child care program for six to forty children aged two-and-a-half to five years who play together regularly each day for a few hours, or a few times a week.

The Department of Health and Social Services emphasizes standards regarding facilities, staffing, and programs that are common to family day homes, day nurseries, and play groups. Day care centers are expected to conform to staffing standards. However these are not regularly enforced. A ratio of one staff member to five children is regarded as a reasonable standard. Staff is certified by the National Nursery Education Board.

One Integrated Child Care System

In Sweden over half of the four-, five-, and six-year-old children are now in organized child care. There is empahsis on integrating physically handicapped mentally retarded children and children from immigrant families into the ordinary preschool program. Communities are required to provide after-school programs for all categories of children seven through twelve years of age. Standards are set by the national government. Centers are open all day from 6:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and serve children from seven months of age (the end of the paid parental child care leave) to seven years. Centers are divided into infant groups from age seven months to three years, and sibling groups from age three to age seven. Staff-child ratios call for at least two persons for each five children under age three, and one for each five children age three to seven.

In Finland more than one-third of the children aged three to seven years are cared for in child care centers or family day care homes. A 50% increase is expected in such care by 1980. It is not expected to be adequate since more than two-thirds of married mothers of preschool children are employed. About 75% of programs are in municipally operated and superviced facilities, while most of the remainder are in publicly subsidized, but privately operated, programs.

Staffing qualifications require two "nursery nurses" for each six children aged six months to one year; two for twelve children aged one to two years; two kindergarten teachers for each 20 children aged three to six years of age. One helper is also required for each group in addition to the professional and custodial staff.

France has the most extensive child care system in Europe with more than 90% of the three to six-year-olds attending the French public preschool program. Nearly all the four and five-year-olds, about 75% of the three-year-olds, and some 25% of the two to three-year-olds attend this program.

Child care in France is basically a dual age related system. However, there is an overlap for children aged two to three years of age. In addition to the public preschools, there are some nursery schools and kindergartens which are private. The French child care programs serve children aged 0 to three years in day care centers and family day care homes. These are supervised by the Ministry of Health, while the preschool programs are under the National Ministry of Education. Local government authorities have a major role in establishing and administering day care centers and family day care homes.

Staffing ratios in day care centers for children under age three are mandated by law and/or administrative regulation as follows:

1 person per 5 children who do not yet walk

1 person per 8 older children

In Poland, standard setting is at the national level. A day care center, nursery or crèche is a social health institution serving children of six weeks to three years whose mothers work. Only a small percentage of children under three are in this program.

Preschools care for children age three to age seven, which is school age. Its objective is to provide all around development of children, prepare them for elementary school, and provide care while parents work. Over 50% of the children attend this program. Staff ratios for day care centers require one professional for every 22 children (plus custodial staff).

In the Federal Republic of Germany, standard setting is at the state level. Day nurseries or day care centers provide care for children under three primarily to meet the needs of working parents or parent. Coverage is less than 1% of the age cohort, or about 4% of children of working mothers. There is little or no family day care except for special demonstration projects.

Kindergarten or preschool care for children of ages three to six, either part day or full day, cover over 60% of the age cohorts.

There is considerable variation is the standards of the various states. Staffing for day care centers in one teacher and one nurse for each mixed age group of up to ten children. For infant groups of up to six children, one nurse and one assistant nurse is required. Toddler groups of up to eight children require one nurse, one assistant nurse, and one kindergarten teacher. In addition, one social worker is required for up to four groups of any category. For preschool children age three to six, for each group or class up to 20 children, requires one teacher and one nurse, plus a social worker for up to four groups.

In Italy, standard setting is at the regional or state level. It has an extensive public preschool program for 3 - 6 year-olds, and about two-thirds of this age group participate.

In Denmark, standard setting is at the municipal level. Some of the 275 municipalities have no facilities, while others provide experiences for as many as 60% of preschoolers. In addition, there are creches, kindergartens, recreational centers, and youth clubs. Both public and private facilities are heavily subsidized by both the national government and the municipality.

Creches are day care facilities that admit children as young as a few weeks. They stress care functions and serve children of working parents. In 1974 creches served 8% of children under age three.

Kindergartens or nursery schools serve children from age two-and-a-half to compulsory school age on a voluntary basis. They stress educational and social functions. In 1974, 30% of children three to seven years of age were in this program.

Family day care is individually provided for children age 0 to six years. Women offering such care are recruited by the authorities, regulated, supervised, and paid by them. In 1974, 5% of the children 0 to six years of age were covered in these arrangements.

Since 1 April 1976, all administration and supervision of child care programs has been removed from the central government and assigned to the municipal administration. Recommended staff ratios for the creches are one qualified preschool teacher and one non-educated staff for each seven children under age three. For kindergartens and nursery schools, the recommended ratio is one teacher and one para-professional for 12 children aged two and three, or 20 children aged four to seven.

Yugoslavia is considered the ultimate in decentralization and has the major program models found in the countries described earlier. There are children's nurseries or day care centers for day time care for children up to the age of four. Preschools involve children aged four to seven. There are combinations of nursery schools and kindergartens, and there are family day care homes.

Standards are set by legislation at the national level and are implemented at local levels. It is recommended that an average day care center serving infants and toddlers to three years of age have one nurse for every 12 children, and that an average preschool should have one teacher for 20 children.

In Israel there are basically two age related systems. Some three to five-year-olds of deprived families are in day care programs rather than preschool. Day care is generally for children of one to three years of age, while preschool is for three and four-year-olds. About 12% of children under three are in day care, and almost 90% of three and four-year-olds are in preschool. The Ministry of Social Welfare is responsible for standards of day care centers, while the Ministry of Education has the responsibility for kindergarten and related programs. Staff ratios in day care centers average one child care professional to 15 children aged one through four years, with additional maintenance and custodial staff. In preschool for children three to five years of age, staff includes at least one teacher and one assistant for a class of 35.

Conclusions

Standards are more likely to vary where there is disparate and varied authority responsible for promulgating standards such as in Canada and Free Republic of Germany. In Sweden, where standards are only recommended at the national level, not required by law, compliance is said to be very high because local governmental officials insist upon a maintenance of high standards.

Most countries set standards regarding physical safety, space, number of children served, staff-child ratios, staff types and staff qualification. There is no consensus, nor even a clear pattern, of specific standards in different categories. There does not seem to be any clear justification for supporting any given staff for a given number of children.

FEDERAL DAY CARE STANDARDS: RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

by
Donald Cohen, M.D., and Edward Zigler, Ph. D.
Yale University

This paper includes sections on history, current federal stance, Title XX and Head Start, rationale for federal standards, criteria for quality, 1972 proposed revisions, infant day care controversy, lessons to guide enforcement, and standards in a mixed system. It contains 15 pages plus 4 pages of References.

Hundreds of thousands of American children spend 8 to 10 hours daily in federal subsidized day care settings for which the federal government spends nearly two billion dollars. The federal government has been reluctant to enforce standards for day care quality. The authors argue that federally subsidized day care should not be detrimental to children. They suggest revisions of Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) and mechanisms for enforcing them.

History

The first day care centers were opened in the 1850's as rescue programs for the children of the poor. They were charitable efforts intended to be temporary aids until mothers would be able to stay home. Day care is not advocated by politicians for the sake of children. They tend to justify it as a social goal such as freeing women to participate more in industry or helping to reduce public welfare rolls. Working women did not return home in the expected numbers after the wars.

During the depression and World War II, there was a considerable increase in the federal expenditures on day care. This day care was considered temporary. Although one might assume that the Children's Bureau would be the likely champion of quality day care, the federal administration was vested in the Works Progress Administration during the depression and in the Office of Defense, Health and Welfare Services during World War II. The nearly 3,000 wartime day care facilities were exempt from all federal and state regulations during the war. At the end of the war, the day care system was quickly disassembled even though large numbers of mothers continued in the work force.

Current federal stance

At least 12 different federal agencies have been vested in day care. No single federal agency was given financial responsibility to coordinate the maze of day care, nor the power to enforce standards of quality. The primary justification for Title XX day care is to reduce welfare rolls rather than to help children. There is no evidence that day care helps welfare parents become working parents.

Title XX and welfare: Separate and unequal

Day care strategy and fiscal control is important to day care standards. Although Head Start and Title XX are both programs to serve children of the economically disadvantaged, these two groups of children are treated very differently. Head Start has been viewed from the beginning as a quality program to benefit children. Its educational and health components are designed to meet the needs of the children it serves. Head Start has served as a national model of developmental programming for children.

Title XX was originally expected to comply with the 1968 FIDCR. States feared the federal government would not come up with enough money for compliance with the FIDCR. A 1973 HEW audit revealed that 80% of the 552 facilities sampled did not meet the FIDCR, even in basic health and safety areas. Title XX makes day care compete for funds with other social services such as for the aged and handicapped.

Rationale for the federal standards

There is considerable variation in licensing laws between the states and even between localities in a single state. Typically, day care licensing laws concern themselves with physical safety of children. Criteria of day care quality such as child to staff ratio and competency of caregiver are neglected or ignored in many state licensing laws. States are probably more effective than the federal level in monitoring standards.

There is not too much hard data to guide social policy. Policymakers have a responsibility to take a reasonable course of action and to endorse the program least likely to be detrimental to children and families.

Criteria for quality

While the cost effectiveness stalwarts favored custodial day care, the quality-at-any-price advocates favored comprehensive day care. The authors advocated developmental day care which provides the minimal services necessary to guarantee the healthy development of a child.

Misleading rhetoric plagued discussion of the 1968 FIDCR often cited as the manifesto of quality day care.

The 1968 FIDCR

The 1968 FIDCR, that were hastily written, reflect the state of the day care art at the time. They were based largely on the Head Start's experience and were deliberately unspecific and more guidelines than clearly defined standards. Enforcement has never really been attempted. The 1968 FIDCR were primarily concerned with center-based day care which serves only a small proportion of the children in day care. Provider and administering agency responsibilities were not clearly defined in them. The 1968 FIDCR did not provide caregiver criteria for infants and toddlers.

1972 propsed revisions

The revision process of the FIDCR began in the Airlie House conference of 1970 with a thousand Americans, including providers and parents of children in day care. For the following two years, the Office of Child Development worked on and finalized the 1972 FIDCR. The new standards were analyzed for cost, and the day care state licensing laws of every state were examined. HEW Secretary Elliott Richardson approved the revisions and sent them to the Office of Management of the Budget whose approval was necessary before publication. The 1972 revisions disappeared in the Office of Management of the Budget.

The 1972 proposed standards were more appropriate and enforceable than the 1968 FIDCR. The 1972 revisions also reflected the fact that most day care is reflected in homes rather than in centers. They provide for the specific needs of infants and toddlers and are more precise on staff competency and the responsibilities of administering agencies and day care providers. The 1968 FIDCRs required one adult per five children of three to four years of age, one adult per seven children four to

six years of age, and one adult per ten children six to fourteen years of age, with no requirement for infants and toddlers under three years. The 1972 FIDCR required one caregiver per three infants up to one and a half years of age, one caregiver for toddlers one and a half to three years of age, one caregiver per seven children three to four and a half years of age, one caregiver per ten children four and a half to six years of age, one caregiver per 13 children six to eight years of age, one caregiver per 16 children nine to 11 years of age, and one caregiver per 20 children 12 to 14 years of age.

Infant day care controversy

As early as 1944, a Children's Bureau conference concluded that children under three did not, in general, benefit from group day care. While most child development experts suggest extreme caution in group care for very young children, more and more parents are placing children under three in day care. There is no clear evidence that infant day care of adequate quality harms children. Experts do not associate infant day care with any marked deleterious consequences. Studies do not take into account real life alternatives to day care, e.g., the effects of day care versus the effects of being parked in front of a TV all day. In deciding on a one to three ratio for infants, the committee took into consideration those interests of a mother who needs a place for her infant, the provider who must operate without losing money, and the young child who needs a special kind of caring.

Lessons on guide enforcement

Complying with complex fire, building and zoning, as well as other codes, which were not designed especially for day care, has made licensed day care very expensive. Model state licensing codes, which were developed by the Office of Child Development, are making inroads against the antiquated procedures and problems.

A number of lessons emerge from the state and local experience. Those drafting new federal standards must be careful to cost out any day care dictated by the standards as was done for the 1972 revisions. Standards are meaningless without a national monitoring system. Since such a system involving sufficient federal personnel would be too costly, the authors propose monitoring by parent users of day care and the volunteer consumer advocacy group, as well as by government agencies. It is unreasonable to expect that standards be met overnight. There must be a grace period for all but the most serious deficiencies.

Standards in a mixed system

While some feel that the public schools could best guarantee the delivery of quality day care, others feel just as strongly that the school is the last place for day care. Some child care advocates feel that the biggest issue in the day care quality debate is how to exclude for profit day care from public funds. While the authors do not wish to get into a debate, they merely point out that the pluralism in American day care underscores the importance of federal standards for quality. The federal stance should be neutral on day care delivery allowing all day care to be sampled by schools as well as community organizations. The central issue of federal funds should not be whether for-profit day care should get any of them, but rather, will they comply with quality standards? The authors feel that if federal day care standards were set and enforced, that current battles about the appropriate role of schools in profit making day care could be resolved more satisfactorily.

In conclusion, safety and welfare of children in day care makes it crucial that our nation commit itself to some federal standards for the day care purchased with federal money. The standards should be realistic, reflecting the different needs of children at different ages, and careful analysis for cost with sufficient funds granted to a state to comply with a reasonably clearly defined grace period. History suggests that the same federal agency which sets standards must have the final power to implement those standards.

MULTIGENERATIONAL DAY CARE

by
Paul Kerschner
and
Pamela Harris
University of Southern California, Los Angeles

The main body of the paper, consisting of 98 pages, contains seven chapters dealing with introduction, background, hypotheses, procedures, results, discussion and conclusion. There are an additional 30 pages of bibliography and appendices.

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of the older adult in our society and its impact upon the lives of children. More specifically, the involvement of older adults as paraprofessionals in child care programs was reviewed, in light of the benefits both young and old can receive for this exchange.

The authors' study was to determine whether a multigenerational child care program promotes intergenerational interaction to the benefit of both children and the older adults. The authors were trying to determine whether the participation of the older adults in child care programs as paraprofessional child care workers brings benefits to multigenerational child care which can not be found in traditional child care programs.

Hypotheses

1. Children's increased contact with older adults will diminish stereotypes and create more positive attitudes towards the aged. It will also increase children's perception and knowledge of old age. Hence, children in a multigenerational child care program, one with older adults as child care workers as well younger adults, will maintain more positive attitudes towards older adults, as well as develop imporved perception and knowledge of other adults than children in a traditional child care program.

2. Children from two child care programs will be compared for the number of relationships they have with older adults at home, the closeness of their relationships with older adults at home, and their frequency of contact with older adults at home. It is proposed that there are no differences between the two groups of children from the two child care programs and the three areas of investigation.

3. The attitudes of the parents of the children from the two child care programs will be compared for their attitude towards the utilization of older adults as paraprofessional child care workers in child care programs. It is proposed that the parents of the children from the multigenerational child care program will have more positive attitudes toward older adults as paraprofessional child care workers.

4. Older adults in the child care program assist in individualized one-to-one relationships with the children which has resulted in improvement in the behavior of institutionalized children. Therefore, due to the

presence of the older adult in the child care program, the parents whose children are in the multigenerational child care program, will have more positive feelings concerning improvement in their children's behavior than will the parents whose children are in the traditional child care program.

Program Description and Methodology

In order to obtain the data for the study, two child care programs were selected. One was a multigenerational college based child care program, with foster grandparents who assisted in its activities. Foster grandparents had participated in this program for the past three years. The second program was a traditional church based child care program. Both programs were matched for staff/child ratio, level of professionalism, and the type of families who utilized the two facilities.

A total of 18 children, nine for each child care center were selected to obtain the data for the study. Three boys, and six girls, ages three to five, were selected from each program. All parents, except one, were black. The one exception was white.

The instruments and methods used to gather the data were: the Preschool Racial Attitude Measure Test, the Mann-Whitney U Method of Measurement, Fisher's Exact Test, three questions asked of the children, parent questionnaire, observations, and interviews with the child care programs' professionals and paraprofessionals.

Results of the Study

The results were discussed in terms of three methods of research: empirical research, observational data and interviews with professionals and paraprofessionals.

The data from the empirical research showed limited evidence that attitudes toward older adults were affected in the two child care programs. Also, there were no significant differences in the children's knowledge of the meaning of the word "old", but the multigenerational sample did demonstrate a greater recognition and ability to describe an older adult than the traditional sample.

There appeared to be a small amount of evidence of differences in relationships the two child care samples had with older adults outside the center; children in the multigenerational program had more relationships with older adults outside the program than those children from the traditional child care program.

Parents from the multigenerational child care program were more positive toward the use of older paraprofessionals, but more negative about improvement in their child's behavior than parents from the traditional child care program.

The authors had difficulty in discussing the observational research conducted at the two child care programs since there were differences in the child care philosophies practiced at the two sites and in physical layout of the two facilities.

The role of the older adult in the child care program, as designated by the observation/participation research is very distinctive. Older adults appear to enhance emotional development by providing a warm lap and some empathy for children in their most needy moments. The children seemed to also instinctively have known that this older individual provided the affectionate nurturing they were seeking. In contrast to the traditional child care program where there was no older adult participating, there was also very little nurturing or affection going on between staff and child; therefore, these children were missing out on this level of interaction.

The children at the multigenerational child care program were also more cooperative and less aggressive with the older adults. This could possibly be interpreted as a sensitivity on the part of the children to the lower energy levels of older adults. The children in the multigenerational child care program have developed a sensitivity to the needs of older adults and, hence, a maturation in their social and behavioral skills.

The role of the older adult in the child care program does not necessarily determine the child's behavior toward others. Nor was the level of the children's conflict with others in the multigenerational child care program reflective of or tied in with the presence of older adults. The greater degree of conflict between child/staff and child/child, cited in the muligenerational child care program, can best be tied in with the mode of child care philosophy practiced here, where the children were allowed autonomy and independence in their actions.

Due to the disparity in the child care philosophies of the two programs, there was no grounds for comparison in observing the behavior of the two groups of children. Each program had to be looked at individlly for its strengths and weaknesses and judged by what it was that parents and staff hoped the children received from the program.

This does not negate that the older adult does bring additional benefits to the multigenerational child care program in offering nurturance and support to the child's development. The traditional child care program lacked a giving individual whom the children can run to for additional comfort and affection. The older adult provided the special kind of attention that the teacher often times is too busy or too preoccupied to give. This, in itself, makes such a program not only highly innovative, but shows a concern for meeting all the children's needs.

Professionals felt that the spread of age group was also an important contribution, since some children have no grandparents or their contact with older adults is limited.

When asked about the negative responses, the professionals felt that the old adults were no more effective with children in the child care program, than younger individuals. Instead, they felt that a care provider should be judged as an individual and not by his/her age. They felt that a special orientation training program was needed to familiarize them with the philosophy of the child care program and general guidelines as to their role in the program.

To summarize the data from the interviews, the older adults interviewed saw themselves in a helping role with the children and felt that they contributed much to the children's happiness. For themselves they felt that their work offered more meaning to their lives.

The professionals and paraprofessionals together saw a necessity in offering an orientation program for the older paraprofessional as well as ongoing feedback between older paraprofessional and supervisor, as was also indicated in the readings. The need for educational background was given minimal emphasis by both sets of interviewees, with the belief that the love of children was far more significant.

Nonetheless, disagreements did occur in the area of inflexibility. The older paraprofessionals perceived themselves as being much more open to change and accepting change in the child care program than the professionals saw them to be or felt that they could be. The quality of inflexibility was the one most cited as a negative characteristic of older adults by the professionals.

Another area of disparity occurred over guideline questions. The professionals designated that older adults could work more hours a day than the older adults felt they could work; that is, the professionals felt that the older adults could work as much as six hours a day and the older

adults felt that they could work no more than four hours a day. The older adults also perceived themselves as handling up to fifteen children in that time period, whereas the professionals felt that three children were sufficient for an older paraprofessional to handle at any one time.

All in all, the professionals and paraprofessionals seem to agree that the older adult has much to contribute to the child care program, especially for the minority child since they can act as a linkage between home environment and child care environment, and for those children who do not have grandparents they can provide the warmth and comfort that an older adult has to provide.

As formulated through the interview with the professional or institutionalized older adults working in child care programs, all measures must be taken to allay fears, promote the privacy of residents, and to educate all individuals on the potentials of all older adults working in child care programs. Without this sensitizing neither the needs of the old or the young will be fulfilled in this environment or any other child care program utilizing the talents and skills of older adults.

Conclusion of the Study

The empirical research conducted in this study brought forth only minor effects concerning the role of the older adults in the child care program, as opposed to the effects brought out through observations and interviews, which specified that older adults do contribute additional benefits to the child care program. The observations and interviews indicate that the children benefit a great deal from the individualized care, warmth, and comfort the older adult provides. Although the observations could not verify improvement in children's social and cognitive skills as a result of the older adults' presence in the child care program, the readings indicated that institutionalized children have improved in these skills due to this special attention given to them by older paraprofessionals. Therefore, it is probable that this same individualized care could also improve social and cognitive skills in children receiving it within a child care program.

The involvement of the older adult in the child care program also fulfills needs for them. It was also apparent from the interviews conducted with the paraprofessionals that their work was meaningful to them and made them feel useful. Such paraprofessional programs also benefit the older adult financially, especially in the case of the older Black female who suffers greatly from poverty.

The area of staff professionalism and training is an area that has been ignored in the past in dealing with older adults. It seems that special training programs are required for individuals working with children, but not with older adults. Since older adults have special needs too, it is essential that staffs working with older adults have some training in this field. Training should also be conducted with older adults so they can have some comprehension of what is involved in child care. Thus, it follows that individuals are best prepared to train older adults and work with them in child care programs when they have some knowledge and understanding of the capabilities of older adults.

When the training and sensitizing of staffs working in multigenerational environments is well carried out, then a successful program can be accomplished which serves the needs of many individuals and perhaps a community. The multigenerational day care program has the potential for fulfilling the commitment that child care serves the community. It establishes a place where young and old can have contact and have their needs met, thus serving a broad range of ages. It also reinforces cultural lifestyles and a continuity between home and child care program, for enrollees whose heritage professes extended ties and sees the grandparent role as a significant part of family life. For those children who do not have contact with grandparents it enables them to incorporate older adults into their development for further enhancement of emotional or psychological needs and for "re-establishing a sense of community".

Therefore, this study has come full circle in discussing the necessary elements involved in creating a viable multigenerational child care program; from the benefits the older adults have to offer to the benefits they have to gain, to the successful integration of old and young in child care programs, followed by the specification of Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, in order to benefit and service an entire community through child care programs.

THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE ON PRESCHOOLERS AND THE PROVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES FOR DAY CARE FAMILIES

by
Christoph M. Heinicke, Ph. D.
and
Larry M. Strassmann, Ph. D.
Department of Psychiatry and Bio-Behavioral Sciences, U.C.L.A.

This paper includes a bibliography and three sections: The Effects of Day Care on the Development of the Preschool (3 to 5 year old) Child; Direct family Intervention as a Desirable Component of Day Care Services; and Concluding Remarks. It contains 28 pages plus 5 pages of Bibliography.

The paper attempts to document the proposition that the provision of direct and supportive services to parents using day care is likely to be of great significance in optimizing the total day care experience of child and family.

On the basis fo their own research and that of others, the authors recommend that licensing regulations require that a day care facility shall provide: (a) experience promoting children's emotional, social, and intellectual growth and well-being; (b) active and passive learning experiences which promote development of skills, social competence, self-esteem, and positive self-identity; (c) learning experiences in consultation with parents to ensure harmony with lifestyle and cultural background of children; and (d) services for the parents or caretaker that are supportive to parenting roles, as well as children's individual development.

I. The Effects of Day Care on the Development of the Preschool (3 to 5 year old) Child

There is very little meaningful research delineating the developmental effects on the child in day care per se. There is some evidence that indicates that the preschool child who has been in center day care since infancy may not be developing as well as his home-reared counterpart. They point out that much of the research has been based on nursery school and preschool, and that there are limitations to reaching viable conclusions. There may be differences between a 3-year-old who has been separated from the mother for eight hours or more versus four hours or less. They point out that an important cluster of child development variables is the adaptation competence. This cluster of behavior includes the I.Q., capacity for peer relationships, task orientation, the

ability to move from the primary caregiver to a new relationship, and the ability to modulate aggression.

A. I.Q.

Several studies have shown that Head Start and other experimental intervention programs increase the I.Q. of children who participated in day care center programs. Several other studies tend to indicate that the I.Q. of day care children is not significantly different from comparable groups that did not attend day care.

B. **Peer Relationships**

Several studies show that children in day care prior to age three have higher levels of peer interaction than children without prior day care experience. Day care experienced children tend to have greater social ease.

C. **The Transition from the Relationship to the Primary Caretaker to New Relationships in the Day Care Center.**

Results of the research using criteria such as adjustment, crying, and following parents are difficult to interpret clearly.

D. **Task Orientation and the Modulation of Aggression.**

Infants who had been in day care exceeded their previously home-reared counterparts in physical and verbal aggression towards peers and adults. They also tended to be less cooperative, did more running around, and less sitting in one place.

Prescott and others found that when center teachers made most of the choices of activities for children, the children tended to be significantly higher on obeying, giving stereotyped responses, and responding to questions. In contrast, children who are allowed to choose their activities tended to be higher on a number of task oriented dimensions and a degree of physical activity. The authors felt that any program heavily concentrating on either structure might fail to provide an optimally productive environment for at least some children. They suggest that a closed structure, which children have relatively little choice of activities, might be too pressureful for actively involved children, frustrated children, and non-adjusted children. On the other hand, if children are allowed too much choice without some measure of privacy and adult support, the socially timid child and the cautious child might be overly stimulated.

Findings by Beller and Associates show that homogeneous groupings of children, in terms of age and social class, result in children spending more time alone, staring at others, and engaging in aimless activities. Homogeneous environments tend to foster more time cooperating with each other. Teachers in heterogeneous age groups tended to show more warmth and sensitivity to children's needs. Children from heterogeneous age groups seem to be more sensitive and responsive to the teachers' needs. The authors of the paper raised questions in terms of self-selecting factors at work with certain types of personalities choosing certain types of settings.

II. Direct Family Intervention as a Desirable Component of Day Care Services

Studies involving middle-class families showed that consistent control by parents was related to greater maturity of children, and better communication and more affection on the part of children. The preschool children from such environments tended to be more socialized, self-controlled, affiliative, self-reliant, self-assertive, realistic, confident, and content.

The parents' interaction with their children is an important determinant of children's development. The child's relationship to the primary caretaker exerts a maximal influence.

Preschool intervention seems to bring about gains in I.Q. and other cognitive measures that may be lost during follow-up periods. Parent-child intervention involving training of the parent to promote verbal interaction tends to result in substantial lasting gains in I.Q. The greatest gains are those of children entering an intervention program at one or two years of age.

Research show that the earlier the family intervention is introduced in the life of a child, the greater the gains the child makes in cognitive development.

The total development of the child including his adaptation to day care is likely to take a more progressive direction if the quality of the family interaction is improved.

In one study, the Toy Demonstrator visited each home bi-weekly, bringing gifts of various Verbal Interaction Stimulus Materials and encouraging the development of competence in the verbal interaction of mother and infant around the use of this material. Merely making a friendly visit or simply providing the stimulating material was not sufficient to produce a major effect. The critical element involved change in the quality of mother-infant interrelationship.

Children exposed to the enhancement of mother-child interaction showed further gains in I.Q. of 10 to 15 points in kindergarten even though family intervention was no longer being offered.

Certain open-ended social work services yielded improvements in both parents and children. Parents showed improvements in new relationship; cognitive experiences, limit-setting and providing an organized environment. Their children showed improvements in adaptation-competence and task orientation.

Family intervention should be a support service for day care.

III. Concluding Remarks

Certain forms of family intervention in connection with developmental day care are likely to make significant contributions to the total experience of the child.

There seems to be little differences between preschoolers with previous day care experiences and those reared at home in terms of disturbance around separation and reunion from the parent. Day care children show a greater ease with peers.

There is some indication that task orientation and modulation of aggression of day care preschool children is less well developed.

Public health policy has, in recent years, focused on such obviously serious factors as child abuse and drug addiction. The evidence reviewed here in regard to day care, raises the larger issue that certain less obviously traumatic rearing conditions may nevertheless have a pervasive effect on the character development of the child. We do know that task orientation and aggression modulation is correlated with later ability to learn in school.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STAFFING CHARACTERISTICS TO CHILD OUTCOMES IN DAY CARE

by
Ura Jean Oyemade, Michele Chargois
Program in Human Development,
School of Human Ecology,
Howard University, Washington, D.C.

The five sections of this paper consist of (1) introduction, (2) staffing criteria, (3) conclusions and recommendations, (4) bibliography, and (5) an appendix on qualifications of child care center staff under state regulations. The introduction includes a rationale, a definition of quality care, and staff as a key to effectiveness. The section on staffing criteria deals with categories of staff, experience and training requirements, certification, impact of staff characteristics, and staff to child ratios. The paper contains 47 pages with an additional 10 pages of bibliography and 8 pages of appendix.

I. Introduction

The rationale for day care

Developmental goals for all children is a primary concern of the federal government, as well as that of state and local governments. Publicly financed programs such as Head Start and day care proliferated in the past decade because of the importance of learning experiences early in life, the promotion of day care, public assistance programs, and the importance of day care to positive child development.

Toward a definition of quality day care

Quality day care, which is nearly everyone's concern, must be defined in terms of outcomes. Positive child development programs must be oriented to the broard spectrum of developmental needs of infants and children at various ages and stages. Providing nutrition, meeting dependency needs, and promoting independence and positive social interaction have all been supported as necessary for adequate child development up to age three.

A key to effectiveness: Staff

The interrelationships between individuals and environments have relevance to program practices. Characteristics of staff are important to program outcomes.

Staffing Criteria

The objective of the paper is to discuss specific levels of competence for day care center staff, and to describe the impact of the competence on the children.

Categories of staff necessary for quality day care

The ideal day care program should be comprised of center director, director of social services, coordinator of parent activities, director of nutrition, health personnel, coordinator of volunteers, custodial staff, teachers, and teachers' aides. A description of the responsibilities and duties, as well as the qualifications for each of these positions is described.

Experience and training requirements of direct caregivers

Most states require limited training for teachers in child care. Certification and supervision of training for day care personnel is usually under the auspices of state agencies and institutions. The authors view the present training programs as a somewhat haphazard approach. Research findings on the basic requirements of a day care teacher are inconclusive. An authority is cited as maintaining that a preschool teacher should possess specialized training in early childhood education, in addition to diverse course work in language, science, and the fine arts. Knowledge supposedly enhances performance.

Mention is made of the Child Development Associate Program, initiated by Zigler, which advocates competencies and skills rather than certification with college degrees.

The Skeels and Dye study is cited to show that mentally retarded adolescent girls could provide effective care for infant orphans. Other studies show that individuals can become effective preschool tutors with relatively brief specific intervention techniques. Comparative assessment of various effects of professional, volunteer, and untrained teachers suggest that paraprofessionals are equally effective. Paraprofessionals can be trained to manifest behavior, communication, and interaction appropriate to provide care for children in a relatively short period of one or two months. One study showed no significant difference between performance of traditionally trained workers and those of untrained workers in those six competency areas required of the Child Development Associate Program. Competency based credentialing of teachers is discussed. One model defines competencies as cognitive, performance and consequences. Cognitive competence has to do with the teacher's knowledge of the subject matter. Performance competence has to do with the teacher's knowledge of the subject matter. Performance competence is measured by what the teacher does in the classroom. Consequence competence relates to results evidenced by pupil accomplishment. The authors feel it would be unwise to include CDA competencies for criteria for day care center staff in federal regulations until more data is available on the training program impact on the child.

Certification

The certification process for preschool day care should incorporate the central issue of quality, not quantity. Unique training and preparation in areas of motor, social, emotional, and personality development of young children are essential. Competencies required for caregivers should be compatible with day care's accepted goals; competence should be in areas in addition to direct teaching. Both traditional and culturally related competency and training should be included.

Impact of staff characteristics

The characteristics of teachers and caregivers, and the setting in which they interact with students, are reflected in the responses of children. A teacher never knows where his influence stops. There is relatively little reliable and valid research evidence concerning the nature of a good teacher. A review of the literature shows it voluminous and contradictory.

Both social characteristics and a teacher's scholarliness should be considered in the determination of licensing or credentialing criteria. A day care teacher is both a teacher and a caregiver. As a teacher, her role is the development of cognitive skills, strategies, and interest in the child. As a caregiver, she is responsible for the gratification of the child's needs and the facilitation of program goals such as adequate nutrition and socialization. The authors present evidence that failure to consider style in the selection of staff members may present serious consequences for the development of children. Those teachers who emphasized skills, consideration, creativity and pleasure showed higher levels of interest on behalf of students in preschool activities. There is evidence that personal interest and individual attention by the teacher is related to children's personal qualities: confidence, creativity, affection for teachers, and affection for other children. These are also related to superior performance in school and on I. Q. tests. There is a positive relation

between achievement gains in reading and vocabulary and ratings of stimulative on the part of the teacher. There is some evidance to indicate that more favorable attitudes and interaction occur with caregivers who are also members of the same minority groups as their students. A significant proportion of day care staff should be of the same ethnic and cultural backgrounds as those of the children they serve.

Staff: Child ratios

Most federally funded centers have not been able to comply with the requirements of adult to child ratios of the 1968 FIDCR because of budgetary constraints. A reduction in the escalating cost of day care requires a reduction in staff and salaries and the use of volunteers. Problems in the use of volunteers are discussed. There is little research which demonstrates the effects of staff-child ratios on the child.

III. Conclusions and Recommendations.

Day care programs must employ workers who are flexible, receptive to suggestions, relate well to children's needs, and are interested and perseverant. The tendency to utilize volunteers who are less well qualified than paid staff is unfortunate. Investigators have identified personality characteristics which are of critical importance for infants and young children. These include warmth, gratification from interaction, emotional maturity, aspects of personal history, and aspects of experience. Until specific competencies have been defined and empirically validated for specific populations, they should not be included in federal guidelines. Appropriate group sizes and adult to child ratios should be evolved from the current federal research effort. Including adult to child ratios in a regulation, must also reflect the availability of funding to the day care program for whom the requirements are prescribed.

THE EFFECTS ON CHILDREN OF THE ORGANIZATION AND THE DESIGN OF THE DAY CARE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.....

Appropriateness of the Federal Inter-Agency Day Care Requirements.

by
Charito Kruvant
Ginny Redish
Associates for Renewal In Education, Washington, D.C.

This report consists of 83 pages, including a bibliography and a persons consulted. Sections deal with specificity of FIDCR, zoning, safety and sanitation, handicapped children, square footage, quality space design, outdoor space, equipment and materials and improving implementation of the FIDCR. (September 1976.)

The design and organization of the physical environment has a profound impact on all the factors that describe quality day care: on adult-child interactions, child-child interactions, children's physical and mental well being, children's independence and cooperation, and the development of social skills and cognitive learning. Research studies as well as observations by day care workers tell us that certain space designs are conducive to positive interactions and to smoothly functioning programs while other physical settings hinder achievement of parental and program goals.

While federal regulations cannot and should not dictate specific physical environments, there are certain principles of quality space usage that could become compliance requirements for federally funded programs. In this summary we repeat each of the major recommendations made in the paper. The discussion of supporting evidence and rationale for each of these recommendations will be found in the body of the text.

Major conclusions and recommendations:

- The federal government should continue to regulate child care in federally subsidized programs.
- The FIDCR should be bolstered by the addition of compliance requirements such as those given in the **Guides for Day Care Licensing.**
- As a compliance requirement for the implementation of FIDCR IIA2b that "convenience to the home or work site of parents. . ." be considered in establishing day care, we suggest: "Day care be allowed in all zoning districts be they residential, commercial or industrial unless it can be shown that hazardous environmental factors are present at that location."
- In reference to the FIDCR on Safety and Sanitation, the specific requirements in the **Guides for Day Care Licensing,** pp. 34 - 44, on Fire and Safety Requirements should be made part of the FIDCR.
- In reference to the Interagency Requirement on handicapped children, we recommend that the following additions be made to the FIDCR: Wherever structural factors are the inhibitors of inclusion of handicapped children in a day care program, every effort should be made to eliminate these barriers. The administrative agency should be required to help the day care provider obtain technical assistance in space design and to obtain funding necessary to make space accessible to handicapped children. The administrative agency which places a handicapped child in a day care program must also be responsible for training the day care staff in the special needs of these children and provide technical assistance in integrating these children into the ongoing program and/or adjusting the program for them. Where the space and program cannot be altered enough to allow the child to be self-sufficient (because of the child's degree and type of handicap), but the child could enter the program if there were additional staff, the administrative agency placing the child should also provide assistance in securing special funding for the extra adult help required.
- That FIDCR IICIa "adequate indoor and outdoor space. . ." be expanded by the compliance requirements on p. 19 of the **Guides.**
- That further research studies be conducted into the question of minimum space necessary for a given program mode; that ABT Associates analyze the correlations between space per child and other factors that they determine to be indicators of quality day care.
- Research and observational studies suggest that four primary features of quality space are:

  - variety
  - organization into separated areas
  - provision for privacy
  - provision for "soft" areas.

Specific compliance requirements to achieve these features in day care settings are recommended.

- In a program where a majority of the time is spent out of doors, the compliance requirements relating to variety of settings and activities, protected areas, private areas and soft areas, should be applicable to the outdoor facility. In programs where the outdoor area is used only for shorter periods of the day and primarily for physical exercise to supplement well organized and well supplied indoor space, the compliance standards should be recommended goals for the outdoor area.
- The important factors in regard to materials and equipment in a day

care program are sufficient quantity, variety, display organization and cultural relevance. These features should be part of the FIDCR requirements concerning educational standards.

- It is necessary to be concerned with the process of implementation of the FIDCR and studies have shown that the monitoring and licensing process needs improvement.
- The intent of the regulations and the licensing process should not be to close down programs, but to aid child care givers to satisfy the requirements.
- There should be an information packet available to prospective child care providers outlining step-by-step what must be done to be licensed.
- The licensing function should be placed in an agency that is directly concerned with early childhood education.
- Early childhood specialists who become licensing monitors should be trained in applicable regulations.
- The licensing monitor should give technical assistance in how to meet space requirements when requested to do so.
- There should be a coordinating board to eliminate contradictory regulations.
- Performance standards should be flexible with stated alternatives whenever possible.
- Level of acceptable compliance could be built into regulations.
- Planning grants and assurance of continuation of support for well functioning programs would facilitate long range planning which is necessary to amortize the initial costs of setting up the physical facility.
- Licensing authorities should be mandated to maintain lists of technical experts available to help day care providers including experts in space design.
- The use of physical space should be included in the list of specific program areas to be included in inservice training (FIDCR VI).
- FIDCR requirements for training should be continued and emphasized because enabling the child care worker to make educated decisions about the use of physical space is probably the most efficient and practial way to achieve the goal of quality space usage in child care programs.

INFANT DAY CARE AND THE FAMILY: REGULATORY STRATEGIES TO ENSURE PARENT PARTICIPATION

by
Greta G. Fein, Merrill-Palmer Institute

The body of this paper, containing 47 pages, consists of six sections with an emphasis on parent participation. It also has an extensive 10-page bibliography. The two appendices of 56 pages are concerned with the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements and the Report of the Early Childhood Task Force (of the City of New York, July 20, 1970). (July, 1976.)

I. A National Response to Social Change

As more and more mothers join the labor force (almost 5 million who have children under 6 years-of-age), children in increasing numbers are spending major portions of the early years outside their own homes away from their own parents. The social significance of this change is that children are being reared (at least partially) outside the social system evolved by mankind slowly over countless spans of time as the primary cultural expression of the protected personalized and private world of "my child."

As child care and rearing moves from the privacy and authority of the family to other, secondary institutions, children become a special group of public persons whose dependent status will eventually be replaced by an adult status as citizens. As such, it is necessary to ensure that child care outside the home serves the public interest.

Between 1961 and 1973, the labor force participation of married mothers with children under 3 years-of-age increased from 15.3 percent to 29.4 percent. More significantly, a major part of the increase occurred in families where the husband earned over $5,000 a year. In families where the husband earned over $10,000 a year maternal employment increased from 10 percent to 27 percent.

Federally mandated requirements which promote parental involvement in day care, especially in those services targeted for children under 3 years-of-age are examined. The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) were approved in 1968 by pertinent federal agencies. The FIDCR document provided for the first time a public statement of mandatory criteria governing the use of federal funds for the care of children in facilities outside their own homes. The text encompasses two concerns: (1) To protect the physical and psychological well-being of young children who receive care outside their own homes in the absence of their parents or legally designated guardians, and (2) to protect the public from misrepresentation and abusive practices.

Protection of the child asks how we can best ensure that public funds do not support activities which endanger or harm children. This is an important charge even though the number of day care slots, totally or partially supported through federal funds, is less than 10 percent of the number of children under five with working mothers. Although FIDCR applies to the use of federal monies, requirements developed at the federal level can come to be guidelines for others.

Presently there is no national policy concerning the protection of children with regard to corporal punishment in surrogate care situations. Neither is there any national policy which guarantees each child the minimum daily nutritional requirements. On the other hand, there is legislation such as the Child Protection Act of 1966 which applies regardless of the involvement of federal funds. The FIDCR must incorporate existing protective legislation such as this. An additional goal would be to apply protective principles to all children in day care situations.

The 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements bravely attempt to clarify the public responsibility for the care and protection of children outside their own homes. In so doing, a significant section mandates the participation of parents on advisory councils.

II. Parent Participation in Poverty Programs for Children

Beginning with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the relations between parents and social institutions entered a new era of public regulation. At the core of the legislation was the community action program, defined as one which is developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation for the residents of the areas and members of the groups served.

In 1967 the role of parent as decision maker became clearly enunciated in the amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. It required direct participation of parents of children in Head Start in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level.

The revised Head Start Manual (August 1970) extended the objectives of parent participation to include human development goals for parents themselves and opportunities for parents to influence the program.

Parents were given veto power and elected to policy making bodies.

The principle of participation is entirely consistent with the value sytem of a democratic society. That principle is incorporated into the Bill of Rights, and has been elaborated over time to prevent the systematic exclusion of persons from political, economic and educational activities. The civil rights movement of the late 1950's and early 1960's applied that principle to a panoply of visible and hidden injustices. In the process, the nation became sensitized, as it perhaps had never been before, to the subtle and devious ways in which citizens, especially the poor, are effectively blocked from participation in the major institutions of our society.

The spotlight landed on institutions such as hospitals, schools, and welfare agencies to which the principle of participation did not ordinarily apply. The white middle-class community had exerted control over the policies of these institutions for some time. By contrast, the poor were disenfranchized. Programs developed by such institutions tended to be carried out in a paternalistic manner which highlighted the sense of competence and control of the profession and deepened the sense of failure and helplessness of the poor.

Psychologically, it was held that the apathy, self-contempt and hopelessness of poverty could only be remedied where people had an opportunity to learn the connections between their activities and social consequences. It was especially important to enhance the competence - - i.e., power and control - - of parents. Parents were seen as the primary socializing agents of children. It was they who best knew what their children needed, and who would provide those things were they able. If the confidence and ability of parents were enhanced, if parents learned, for example, how to plan, and how to implement plans, they would transfer these skills to the management of home and children.

Parent participation in a learning experience stressed two issues. The first was that of the family being a major socializing and protecting agency for the child. The second had to do with sustaining opportunities and benefits of the preschool program at home.

The 1967 Head Start Policies Manual states that there are at least four major kinds of parent participation in Head Start. Three of these provide opportunities for ongoing contact between parents and staff: (a) participation in the classroom as paid employees, volunteers or observers; (b) educational activities for the parents which they have helped to develop; and (c) welcoming center staffs into their homes for discussions of the ways in which a parent can contribute to the child's development at home.

The current consensus on Head Start efforts seems to be that (1) the more intensive the involvement, the more noticeable the difference in child performance; (2) the more the parent's self-perception is that of the primary educator of her child the stronger the effect she has on the child's intellectual development; (3) although parent employment as a child care worker seems to have beneficial effects on the intellectual development of their own children, little is known about the impact of such employment on the family constellation; (4) programs designed for the parents of infants seem to produce benefits which are sustained after the program terminates.

If brief, reviewers have concluded that the most successful programs tended to have a strong parent focus, and a strong parent participation component. But, in addition, they had a clear sense of purpose, and they displayed high levels of skill - - managerial, interpersonal, and intellectual. One might surmise that the programs which best supported change were those that were able to modify the social structure enough to encourage the kind of parent participation which then enhanced parent skills and the skills of children.

III. Parent Participation and Day Care

Less than 10 percent of children in day care settings receive Federal support. Day care centers provide less than 8 percent of total out-of-home care. Some 60 percent of centers are proprietary. Approximately 90 percent of day care consists of unlicensed informal home care arrangements.

While only a small proportion of the over 2 million children of working mothers in out-of-home care receive direct public subsidies, a significantly large number of children and families would be involved in any parent participation system mandated by the FIDCR. Justification for parent participation in day care comes from the responsibility of parents to rear children.

As more and more mothers join the work force, the danger increases that the family, as a primary child rearing institution, will be replaced by secondary institutions. Some authorities have raised questions regarding the adequate protection of children, and whether institutions will honor the values and wishes of the families they serve. Communal participatory mechanisms, such as parent advisory bodies, involve a system in which parents delegate decision making authority at the institutional level to their elected representatives.

An informed parent can retain regulatory control over the "fit" between the family and the surrogate care arrangement. The monitoring and negotiating function of working parents is difficult to sustain. The author claims that child care issues rarely become a matter of public debate or newspaper headlines. Parents can serve an invaluable oversight function to ensure accountability in the use of public funds.

IV. The Young Child: Protection and Development

There is some evidence that malnutrition, whatever its basis, affects physical as well as neural growth. Among the many areas of development to receive careful scrutiny, studies of social and emotional development have caused us to perceive the infant as a sublimely social human being. Toward the first 9 months of age signs of separation anxiety appear. The baby becomes distressed when the parent leaves, which to many investigators indexes the child's psychological attachment to the parent.

Our discussion was intended to establish the following issues pertaining to parent participation: (1) The infant is physically and emotionally vulnerable; special provisions must be made to monitor the child's well being when care is provided outside the home. (2) Disruptions in the continuity of care are likely to be stressful for the child. Since parents are the most viable sources of continuity for the child, the interface between the family and the surrogate caregiver must be broad, the overlap extensive, and the transition between home and institution as smooth as possible. (3) Although it may be difficult for day care programs to enhance children's development when home conditions function to depress it, poorly formed child care arrangements might depress development when home conditions would function to enhance it. (4) Information regarding conditions which enhance children's development is available though not necessarily accessible to most parents. Although the information is not easily translated into quantifiable criteria, access to such information is essential if parents are to function as wise and knowledgeable monitors of child care arrangements.

V. Parent Participation and Federal Requirements

Of all the problems posed by the prospect of Federal regulation, the issue of parental involvement is probably the least controversial in principle and the least costly in practice. Certainly, the rhetoric of politicians, religious leaders, and professionals seems to reflect a national consensus regarding the sanctity of the family and the urgency of strengthening the role of parents in the upbringing of children. The rhetoric seems to say that when there is a conflict of interest between the family and a secondary institution, the family must prevail.

In some respects, the 1968 federal day care requirements for parent participation resemble earlier Head Start policies. The requirements cover the following domains and forms of parent involvement: (1) Opportunities must be provided parents to work with the program. (2) Parents must have the opportunity to become involved themselves in the making of decisions concerning the nature and operation of day care facility. (3) Whenever an agency (i.e., an operating or an administering agency) provides day care for 40 or more children, there must be a policy advisory committee or its equivalent. (4) Policy advisory committees must perform productive functions, including, but not limited to: (a) assisting in the development of the programs and approving applications for funding; (b) participating in the nomination and selection of the program director at the operating and/or administering level; (c) advising on the recruitment and selection of staff and volunteers; (d) initiating suggestions and ideas for program improvements; (e) serving as a channel for hearing complaints on the program; (f) assisting in organizing activities for parents: and (g) assuming a degree of responsibility for communicating with parents and encouraging their participation in the program.

In order to demonstrate that alternative formulations are possible, we presented two additional proposals. One, which dealt with regulations at a national level, was rich in detail regarding horizontal collaboration between parent and institution. Appropriate stress was placed upon the importance of the physical presence of well informed, engaged parents along with some detail as to how the presence of parents might be encouraged.

The second formulation, addressed to parent participation at a city level, displayed far more political astuteness. Behind the proposal seems to have been recognition that the connection between parents and social service establishments must occur at the highest level of governmental decision-making and that parent representation on such a body must involve broad segments of the parent community. As a genuine policy-making body, such a group gains status, respect and recognition.

VI. Summary and Conclusions

Today, and for some time into the future, day care parents will constitute a broad segment of the American public, a constituency which crosses social class, race, and ethnicity. Although the purposes of the poverty program do not apply to day care, some of the forms of parent participation evolved by Head Start are appropriate for day care.

Parent participation at a decision making level is essential if parents are to retain a central position in the child rearing enterprise. Parents may participate as advisors or as genuine policymakers.

In view of the foregoing, we make the following recommendations for what would constitute an optimal set of requirements concerning parent participation: (1) In view of the central importance of parents in the rearing of children, we recommend that parent participating be a mandatory requirement for the use of Federal funds whether through direct or indirect means of program support. (2) In order to design viable participatory requirements funding channels must be reassessed; the administrative bodies to which policy bodies are attached must be redesigned so as to take into account direct and indirect sources of Federal funding, local licensing agencies and other local groups currently monitoring or supporting day care services. (3) Parent participation at the day-to-day operating level must be ensured by every means possible ranging from the training of caregivers to the policies of facilities. (4) Parent participation at the highest levels of decision-making must also be ensured. We recommend that a National Child Care Commission be established with membership determined by an elective process. The commission would work with an inter-agency body responsible for child care planning.

With respect to minimum requirements below which, we believe, children might be at risk, we recommend that (1) Parent participation be a mandatory requirement in the direct use of Federal funds for child care services. (2) Some attempt be made to identify major disbursal points in the distribution of Federal funds so that "administering agencies" can be more precisely identified. (3) At the day-to-day operating level, our "optimum" recommendations are also our "minimum" recommendations. (4) The 1968 requirements for parent participation on decision-making bodies not be diluted. (5) Provisions be made for parent participation in an advisory capacity at a national level of decision-making. Representation on an advisory body must be determined by advisory groups established at the administering level.

It is evident from our summary of the literature regarding parent participation and infant development that our policy recommendations were drawn far more from social and political considerations than from firm findings in the field of child development.

THE CHILD CARE MARKET: A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL POLICY

by
C. Russell Hill
Associate Professor of Economics
College of Business Administration
University of South Carolina

This paper consists of four sections on: Introduction, Child Care as Commodity, Review of Previous Analyses, Income Differential in Modal Choice, The Federal Role in the Child Care Market. Its 76 pages include two pages of references. (January 1977).

Introduction

From 1940 to 1975, the number of women participating in the labor force more than doubled, while during the same period, the number of working mothers increased more than eightfold. The projections for 1985 indicate that there will be 6.6 million mothers in the labor force with children under the age of five. This would represent a thirty-two percent increase from 1975. Whatever the relative strengths of the social and economic determinants of this secular trend, it is clear that the movement into the labor force by women with young children could not have occurred without the provision of some mode of child care -- either from within the family or external to it. The purpose of this report is to review and critique several existing studies of the child care market in order to better understand the factors which lead families to use different modes

of child care while the mother is employed. The analysis of the state of the child care market is then used to discuss the Federal role and a variety of Federal policies in this market.

Child Care as a Commodity

The studies chosen for review provide a wide cross-section of sample characterisitcs and methods of analysis. The primary type of study reviewed here is what the economist would term a "demand" analysis. Here child care is treated as a commodity for which the consumer has a preference and these preferences are revealed in a market situation. While studies of the demand for different modes of child care indicate families' preferences for alternative modes, they do not, in general, tell us how these preferences are formed. Policies designed to encourage the use of certain modes of child care would be enhanced if we knew which characteristics of the observed mode that is demanded lead to that choice.

General Summary of Studies

The review of these several studies can be summarized as follows:

1. The utilization studies all indicate that either in-home or informal market care (babysitters or relatives not in the home) is revealed to be the preferred method of caring for preschool children for the majority of households across a wide spectrum of income classes.

2. Mothers appear to be "satisfied" with their present choices of child care arrangements although the survey questions which elicit such responses may lead to rather self-servicing answers.

3. The size and age composition of the family is a critical factor in affecting the family's choice of child care mode. The lack of teenage siblings or other adults, or a one-parent family, sharply increases the probability of the family using an extra-family mode of child care for its preschoolers.

4. The net effect of working women's wage rates and other family income differ in the manner in which they affect modal choice. In two-parent households, for example, the higher the wife's wage rate, the more likely the family is to use both formal and informal market care. Other family income had essentially no net effect on modal choice at all.

5. Because the use of formal modes of child care is poitively related to female earnings, subsidizing this method of care may be regressive in nature. That is, families with higher female earnings will receive greater subsidies.

6. It is difficult to make quantitative judgements regarding quality differentials among child care vendors on the supply side of the market. Most studies, however, use the staff-child ratio as the summary measure to evaluate differences across day care centers or other market providers.

7. The simultaneous existence of day care waiting lists and excess capacity in the day care centers need not imply market disequilibrium. Without further information on the price structure of alternative modes of care, the mere fact of putting one's name on a waiting list in not a reliable indicator of consumer preferences.

The Federal Role in the Child Care Market

The arguments for expanded national day care coverage seem to be based on four factors. First, the number of individuals on the waiting lists of day care centers is quite large; second, the number of female headed households is increasing; third, the labor force participation of women with preschool children has shown a dramatic secular increase; and fourth, there is the impression that self-care or care by older siblings is inadequate care. These factors, by themselves, need not imply a direct Federal role in the child care market nor do they imply an excess demand for formal, institutionalized day care facilities. The studies of the market for preschool child services reviewed in this report do lead us to the following conclusions:

Conclusion 1: Households with working mothers reveal their preferences by purchasing at-home or informal market care for reasons that are economically rational.

Conclusion 2: While most studies indicate that consumers are content with their present method of caring for their children, not enough is known about how preferences are formed and the need for adequate consumer information about alternatives.

Conclusion 3: The size and age composition of the family is a critical factor in affecting a family's choice of child care mode and should, therefore, be an important element in any Federal policy of child care support.

Governmental intervention in a market is justifiable on economic grounds if the private market's demand and supply relationships do not fully measure both the private and social benefits and costs of a transaction. The evidence reviewed here implies that this economic justification for intervention is only weakly supported. The general consensus seems to be that the benefits to society of publically provided day care services are, at best, quite small. This argument is made on economic grounds, however, and other philosophical arguments may be persuasive. For example, the argument is made by women's rights groups that an important step in achieving equality for women is for society to finance the child care costs of those who wish to work. While there is little evidence of a private market failure for child care, the presumed benefits to children of Federally standardized care make it likely that there will be an important Federal role. This role should be one of improving the market in terms of promoting both efficiency and equity. Our last policy conclusion, then, is as follows:

Conclusion 4: Unless and until convincing evidence becomes available regarding the benefits to children of alternative modes of care, Federal policy should be essentially neutral with regard to the promotion of one mode of care over another.

Efficiency and equity would be improved through a system of public and private child care financing together with a mechanism of control on the demand side that blends parental and professional judgements. The proper form of subsidy would be a child care voucher which is given directly to the consumer, not to the vendor, and is applicable to both formal and informal modes of care. The voucher would be both income conditioned and age-structure-of-family conditioned. An essential component of such a voucher system in a mechanism to ensure that parental judgements are well informed about the care of their children and about alternative facilities.

When one looks at the entire child care modal distribution - - both formal and informal market care and nonmarket care - - it is not clear that Federal intervention will "improve" the choice decisions made by households. The evidence reviewed here indicates that consumers choose nonmarket or family modes of care for rational reasons and are likely to continue to do so, regardless of Federal action. The Federal government should, therefore, accept this example of consumer sovereignty and play largely two roles in this market. First, as a catalyst which facilitates consumer choice by providing information on alternative market modes and second, developing a subsidy scheme which is both equitable and flexible enough to ensure an efficient allocation of resources to the desired mode of care.

THE EFFECT OF DAY CARE ON THE INFANT
Jerome Kagan, Harvard University

This report consists of 79 pages, including 3 pages of references. It contains topics of parental concerns about day care, the attachment of infant to mother, the relation of attachment ot socialization, retardation of cognitive development, the teaching of control of impulse, the polluting effect of peers, the effect of form of care, and policy implications.

Introduction

In this position paper Kagan points out that there is insufficient empirical data to support related assumptions about the potential danger of infant day care. Regardless of the cultural vlaues which affect child rearing arrangements and practices, most young children grow up equally adapted to their societies, and increasingly dependent upon their local cultures. All children need to be guaranteed food and protection from excessive disease and physical discomfort. However, Kagan strongly suggests "that children **do not require any specific actions from adults in order to develop optimally**. There is no good evidence to indicate that children must have a certain amount or schedule of cuddling, kissing, spanking, holding or deprivation of privileges in order to become gratified and productive adults." Kagan agrees that the child does have psychological needs, but there is no fixed list of adult behaviors that can be counted on to fill these critical requirements. Thus, to deal effectively with a child's needs means to specify the demands of the community values to which the child must adjust.

Research evidence

Kagan relates some preliminary evidence that group care outside the home does not seem to have an obviously negative impact on infants. The paper proceeds by elaborating the bases for five notes of uncertainty or prejudices American mothers have about day care. The following five conclusions have been abstracted: (1) There is no firm evidence indicating that daily separation from the mother seriously dilutes the infant's attachment to the parent nor is there any firm evidence that a close relation protects the child from later psychic trauma. (2) The issue concerned with the child's intellectual development is not the amount of sensory stimulation the infant receives, but the variety and distinctiveness - - that is - - its quality rather than its quantity. Thus, if the quality of day care were not as stimulating and accelerating of cognitive development as home rearing, then the child's future might be seriously harmed. (3) The day care teacher is generally tolerant of a wide range of behavior in young children and is not unduly concerned with bringing all the children under her care up to the same level of social control. Group care therefore has the risk of failing to train the child in the effective control of anger, aggression and passivity. (4) In group care the child is vulnerable to the influences of other children - - that is - - incorrectly socialized children may infect the good ones with bad ideas and provide incentives for undesirable behavior. And, (5) the middle-class mother often has a conception of herself as the effective agent in monitoring the growth of her child. This conception often rests in the fear that trusting the child's experiences to the unmonitored behavior of hired workers might bring harmful results.

Issues which produce apprehension

The middle-class mother still sees herself as in control of her child's development, and she is reluctant to let that control slip into the hands of others. This may be one of the most important sources of resistance to group care for the young child.

Children from less affluent and less educated families are more likely to attribute their failure in school to biological incompetence, the prejudice of the teacher, or unfair tests, than to motivation and persistence.

Effect of form of care

In his review of the research on the effect of form of care on the child's growth, Kagan concludes that this literature is fragile in quality. However, the initial impression is that group care does not seem to have much of an effect, either facilitating or debilitating, on cognitive development for most children. The little evidence that shows an exception to this impression was cited from a 1930 study, which indicated that children from poorly educated and less privileged families receiving good group care in special centers tended to perform better on the standard tests of development during the first few years of life than if they had been raised totally at home.

Regulation and inspection

Kagan considers it to be unfortunate that the characteristics of a day care center and its staff that can be monitored and regulated objectively by a government agency, like years of education, or number of toilet facilities, do not appear to be of crucial importance. "The attributes that are of importance among caretakers include fondness for children, prior experience in raising children, some knowledge of child development, and a tolerance for the views of others." These qualities can neither be easily measured nor effectively monitored. It is therefore suggested that government agencies might support inspection teams which evaluate the children and staff at particular centers to determine if the development of the children is within limits. This idea is favored over the writing of excessively detailed regulations for the establishment of centers.

The role of government agencies

The role of government agencies in regulating the quality of care in centers, as perceived by Kagan, include the following functions: (1) the ratio of staff to children; (2) space; (3) age of admission; (4) characteristics of the personnel; and (5) risks associated with health and safety, withdrawal, and cognitive development, especially language development. In addition, it is suggested that the regulatory unit should be politically close to the center with regulatory power, for example, awarded to the municipal educational health bureau, or in rural areas, the county or state. Kagan also suggests that it is unwise for a Federal agency to monitor local day care centers.

CONCEPT PAPER ON HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES IN DAY CARE
by
Peggy Pizzo, Day Care Consultant
Washington, D.C.
and
Susan S. Aronson, M.D., FAAP
Medical College of Pennsylvania

The seven sections ,which comprise the main body of the paper, consist of 192 pages. In addition, there are five appendices, making a total of some 311 pages. (September, 1976).

Basic Assumptions of the Authors:

THERE ARE MAJOR RISKS FOR CHILDREN IN DAY CARE WHICH MAY BE MINIMIZED BY RECOGNITION OF THESE RISKS AND THE DEVISING OF PROCEDURES FOR AVOIDING THEM.

The authors assume that day care is a resource for families which can improve and maintain the health and safety of their children; that day care programs can offset the effects of poverty and poor living conditions; that all children, not just those of the poor, need protection while in day care; that without the assurance of such protection, families who must rely upon day care for their children will face additional stresses in their already stressful lives.

The authors with the aid of 375 references from scientific and child welfare literature, and 131 contributors around the country:

1. Describe health and safety risks in day care;
2. Identify day care program characteristics that would help prevent or minimize risk;
3. Describe the current state of health and safety practices in U. S. day care;
4. Make recommendations for federal action and;
5. Discuss the impact of their findings.

A discussion of various concepts of risk related to probability and to possibility of adverse events includes a presentation of assumptions about risk made by insurance, legal, and lay sources. The origins of ambivalences about regulation of day care are analyzed within the context of cultural values, definitions of custodial vs. developmental day care, and common emotional responses to discussion of risk.

What are the Health and Safety risks for Children in Day Care?

The discussion presents available evidence which describes risks to the health and safety of young children both in terms of potential outcome and frequency of incidence. These risks are: motor vehicle and pedestrian accidents, fires and burns, falls, suffocation and ingestion, drowning, infectious diseases, malnutrition, dental disease, lead absorption, hearing loss, developmental disabilities, speech difficulties, allergies, vision problems, and genetically transmitted disease.

In addition, there is a comprehensive discussion of the use of furniture and equipment which does not meet safety standards, and of the misuse of furniture and equipment which does meet standards.

What program characteristics would help prevent or minimize risks?

The control of risks to children is conceptualized as a function of internal (within the day care program) and external (outside resources) characteristics.

Current health and safety practices in day care

The authors examin recent major surveys of health and safety conditions in day care. They conclude that: (1) there are risk enhancing conditions in day care, particularily in the areas of emergency preparedness, accident prevention, fire and burn prevention, detection of lead paint, sanitation, staff health care, health habit assessment, and release from work because of illness of staff. (2) Various studies documented that (a) both the content and the process of regulation by individual states are inadequate for the protection of children from health and safety risks and (b) compliance with existing standards for health and physical plant is not consistently achieved by providers, though providers do not dispute the importance of health and safety standards. (3) The Day Care Management Study of fifty states has described the virtual non-existence of state training and technical assistance for licensing staff and providers in the areas of health and safety features of the physical plant of day care programs, as well as an inadequate rate-setting system in the States.

Conclusions and some options

The authors conclude that the federal government is purchasing day care in which children are at risks greater than they would experience in their own homes; that these risks can be reduced and that the current exposure to day care risks results in increased federal and non-federal payments for medical care for accidents, poisoning, and treatment programs to correct long-term defects.

The authors propose the adoption of specific federal codes as fiscal requirements. They also propose the federal government accept responsibility for leadership in establishing uniform training, research, parent and provider informational services.

Recommendations:

1. There should be immediate development of federal standards, long term development of training, informational services, regulation and monitoring review. Specific regulatory statements are suggested.

2. The climate for successful implementation of these regulations would require adequate funding, and supportive, rather than punitive, monitoring and technical assistance.

3. There should be national adoption of the Child Life Safety Code and the development of two new codes (a) a national Day Care Sanitation Code and (b) a Child Day Care Health and Safety Code. The federal government should require that unless the states have equivalent codes, that the national codes be the prerequisites for all federally funded day care in the states.

4. Specific recommendations are made for the training of federal and state regulatory personnel, for federal sponsorship of an annual national institute and periodic regional institutes on regulation of early childhood programs, and for training courses on health and safety for providers including uses of innovative techniques such as T. V. correspondence courses.

5. A relevant first aid course for provision of first aid in day care settings should be developed and there should be federally sponsored health advocacy training with consultation programs.

6. Training manuals should be developed for use by all levels of personnel. There should also be developed a variety of resources and educational materials to help providers locate and coordinate health resources and to help parents know what health and safety features should be expected from federally funded day care.

7. There should be incentive for health and nutrition consultants to make their services available to day care programs.

8. Further research should study accident rates, transmission and control of common infections; nutrition in day care; the relationship between staff mental health and health and safety in day care; effective coordination of child health services; health and safety knowledge, attitudes, and practices among day care providers nationally; the effectiveness of current health and safety practices, and the development of low-cost risk reducing safety devices which might be used in day care.

What would be the impact of the study recommendations on cost and availability of care

The authors conclude that the costs of most of their recommended program monitoring, training, and ongoing programs are affordable. The authors recognize that there must be some changes in current FIDCR if the provision of child day care is not to be inhibited. They believe that the cost effectiveness of such a program can best be appreciated by comparing program costs of hospitalizations, medical treatment, pain and trauma which might be incurred if our present system continues.

EFFECTS OF INFANT DAY CARE EXPERIENCE ON BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT: RESEARCH AND IMPLICATIONS

Henry N. Ricciuti, Cornell University

This report consists of 54 pages with 4 pages of references. The content includes methodological and analytic issues, review of major research findings, interpretive summary, implications for infant day care guidelines and policies, and role of Federal governement in support of early child care. (October, 1976)

Introduction

This paper reviews critically the major research dealing with the effects of infant day care on development during the first two years of life. Ricciuti defines the various types of day care arrangements, and points out that each of these differ markedly in their stated purposes. In the process, he suggests that the effects of day care environments should be evaluated in light of these differing objectives. For example, one would generally not expect important cognitive gains (or losses) from day care environments that are set up primarily to provide a reasonable equivalent to good home care.

Defining quality care

Some of the specific features of day care environments which come under the rubric of "quality child care," that may make a difference in behavior and developmental outcomes include: (a) caregiver/child ratios; (b) stability and continuity of caregivers; (c) staff qualifications, in-service training and supervision; (d) nature of infant's daily experience; (e) provisions for health, nutrition and safety; (f) consistency between day care and home care practices; (g) parental involvement and participation; (h) support of parental roles and family service; (i) age of initial entry into day care; and (j) amount of day care experience.

Problems in interpreting research

In his efforts to interpret the research data Ricciuti faced: (1) the difficulty in separating out the potential impact of day care experience from that of home and family influences; (2) the possible variation in the effects of day care for groups of infants differing in temperamental characteristics; and (3) the need to distinguish between short-term and long-term effects of day care experience. Thus, he limited his review of major research findings to those related to intellectual or cognitive development, parent-child relationships, and social relationships with other adults and peers.

Research conclusions

Some of the most salient conclusions abstracted from Ricciuti's review follow: (1) High quality group day care for infants and toddlers does not adversely affect their intellectual devleopment. (2) Day care experience is more likely to have a facilitative effect on development in those instances where it provides a substantial supplementation of structured experiences not fully available in the disadvantaged home environment. (3) It is important to provide stable, consistent caregivers with whom infants in day care can readily become familiar and affectionate, and who are available as alternate attachment figures. (4) There appears to be essentially no evidence to support the view that extended day care experience beginning in the first two years of life has a disruptive influence on the affectional relationships between infant and mother. (5) There appears to be little or no systematic data available that separate the effects of the day care experience as such from that of highly salient home influences, especially in terms of infants' ongoing social relationships with peers and adults. And, (6) meeting the most favorable ratios does not necessarily ensure high quality care.

The Federal role

In addition, Ricciuti suggests that the federal government should play a major and significant leadership role in a variety of efforts to strengthen and support optimal conditions of early child care in all its forms. The government can do this by serving in a major advocacy and educational role aimed at advancing the cause of optimal early child care. It should take the lead in developing policies which would permit funds allocated for support of day care outside the home to be used for support of in-home care as well. The federal government should take a leadership role, working closely with the states, in continuing efforts to move from highly desirable to required standards that are reasonable. Finally, it should play an active role in systematic development of assessment and monitoring strategies and procedures, with the collaboration of concerned day care providers and other interested groups involved in day care.

THE EVALUATION OF EXISTING FEDERAL INTERAGENCY DAY CARE REQUIREMENTS "DAY CARE FOR THE SCHOOL-AGE CHILD"

by
Joan M. Bergstrom, Ed. D., and Donna L. Dreher,
Wheelock College, Boston, Mass.

This report consists of seven sections including one on references used for the paper and one on appendices. The total report consists of 133 pages, with 81 pages devoted to its main body, or the first five sections which consist of: (1) Introduction, (2) The appropriateness of current Federal requirements for school-age children, (3) School-age children, (4) Services to be delivered and standards to be met, and (5) Recommendations for types of technical assistance to be provided.

I. Introduction

This paper is concerned with existing Federal regulations and proposes modifications as they relate to after-school programs for the school-age child 5 -14 years of age in group or family day care settings. A diverse group of individuals from a number of disciplines made contributions to this report.

Questionnaire data pertaining to program operations and range of service provided was collected and analyzed.

A literature review was conducted on school-age children covering such areas as a general description of the population, developmental needs, and some of the major risks which school-age children experience.

II. The Appropriateness of the Current Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements for School-Age Children

Examination of the current Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) and communications via letters and personal discussions with community representatives, social workers, program administrators, educators, consumers and members of the medical and health professions yielded various reactions.

Various reactions to the FIDCR by those who work or are involved in after-school programs include: (a) The current requirements are difficult standards for after-school programs receiving federal funds. (b) The current requirements reflect a lack of definition of purpose and are unenforceable given their overall organizational format and design. (c) The current requirements present some problems and can be unenforceable due to their vague wording and the lack of definition of terms. (d) The current requirements are difficult to enforce in that they presume that the administering agency which is the primary funding source will also provide supervision to the operating agency. The requirements do not identify clearly the ultimate source of authority and responsibility for fiscal matters, daily operations, and do not address issues relating to accountability. (e) The current requirements do not address adequately family day care service for school-age children.

Many individuals stated that it was impossible to meet the FIDCR at the given reimbursement rates. Staffing costs are high and volunteers are not available to assist in the centers. The current FIDCR staff training component was declared unrealistic since opportunities for career progression within most centers are said to be limited.

Those living in rural areas and those affiliated with proprietary programs reported that their communities lack consultants and community resources necessary to comply with the regulations. Special focus was on the health and nutritional requirements. A number of operators indicated that the requirement for parent involvement is unrealistic.

The social services and educational services components of the FIDCR were also described as unrealistic and inappropriate by many social service representatives and state licensing staff members.

III. School-Age Children

There are 29 million children between the ages of 6 and 14 in the United States, with nearly 18 million of them having mothers in the labor force. Some 1.6 million children are currently enrolled in before or after-school programs. This represents about 5% of all school-age children. Presently before and after-school programs are virtually nonexistent for Indian, migrant, rural and handicapped children.

One of the areas in which 5 and 6-year-old children need guidance and restriction is in nutritious eating.

Psychologists have termed the years of 6 through 12 as the "latency period", the "school age period" or the "gang age period." During this period, the child spends large amounts of energy and learns problem solving and social interaction skills. The child's peer group, or "the gang", is most important to him at this time, and he spends much time with his peers.

The 12 - 14-year-old children experience psychological changes. During this period of rapid physical growth, the child experiences sexual desires and is more sexually active.

Children 5 - 14 face some of the following problems: alcoholism, drug use and addiction, juvenile running away, obesity, juvenile delinquency, adolescent pregnancy, and the decreasing number of adults at home with school-age children before and after school.

Over-exposure to television is a common problem which school-age children experience.

IV Service to be Delivered and Standards to be Met by Programs Serving School-Age Children

Because current standards of the FIDCR are considered by some to be too strict, as well as too vague, an alternative framework for presenting requirements might be appropriate. Baseline or minimum program regulations could be established below which no program could operate and receive federal funds. At the same time, optimal goal standards could be identified in order to give direction and to provide an incentive for moving beyond the minimum regulations.

The following recommendations as they relate to programmatical issues follow: (1) The FIDCR should mandate that program for school-age children comply with local and state health, fire safety, and zoning requirements. Attention should be given to developing flexible zoning building standards without sacrificing safety and appropriate experiences. (2) FIDCR should mandate minimum staff-child ratios such as:

One Adult per	Number of Children	Ages
	9 - 11	5 - 6 years
	10 - 14	6 - 9 years
	15 - 20	9 - 14 years

(3) The FIDCR should mandate that programs for school-age children provide, but not be limited to, activities which encompass guidance, drug and sex education, personal hygiene, educational counseling, development of social relations with peers and adults, cultural awareness, tutorial supervision, use of community resources, and general recreational activities. (4) The FIDCR should mandate that all programs for school-age children require health examinations for children before enrollment in the program. Each program must also have written plans for health emergencies and personal health files. (5) The FIDCR should state the responsibility of providing social services to school-age children and their families be shared by members of the program staff and the administering staff. (6) The FIDCR should mandate that programs for school-age children plan for and provide nutritionally adequate meals and appropriately scheduled snacks for all children in care. (7) Plans and requirements for parent involvement in after-school programs have to be determined. (8) The FIDCR should mandate that the individuals who care for school-age children should be insured and thus be protected against liability suits.

V. Recommendations for Types of Technical Assistance which the Federal Government should provide to State and Local Agencies

Given the diversity of the programs serving school-age children, there are some specific program components which should not necessarily be mandated, but should be promoted by technical assistance from the federal government. Issues that warrant further consideration include (1) serving children with special needs in programs for school-age children, (2) collection of information on community resources, and (3) informational material and packets which identify some of the problems for school-age children.

Center or home-based programs for school-age children are a natural place to integrate children with special needs.

Staff members of center-based programs, as well as family day care providers, would benefit from information regarding community resources, recreational facilities, and leisure time activities which might be of interest to school-age children.

Information could be available on some of the areas which have been identified as potential problems for school-age children. Some topics for which informational packets could be developed include: alcoholism, drug use and addicition, juvenile running away, teenage pregnancy, overexposure to television and its effect on the school-age child's social, emotional, and cognitive development, and nutritional needs and eating habits.

Since the key to solving many of these issues and problems lies in education, it is important that up to date materials be available to professionals and parents dealing with these issues.

DAY CARE IN CONTEXT: AN ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON RESEARCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

by

Bronfenbrenner, U., Belsky, J., and Steinberg, L.

Cornell University

This document consists of two parts. Part I presents a summary of major conclusions regarding substantive findings of existing day care research in addition to a policy recommendations in light of the research. Part II contains data and analyses underlying the conclusions presented in Part I. It has 57 pages.(December, 1976)

The authors discussed several ways in which the American families are changing. The study, "Toward a National Policy for Children and Families" reveals that each year more and more mothers are entering the work force. More than half of these mothers have school age children, over one-third with children under six and one-third with infants under three; two-thirds of all those mothers are working full time.

As more mothers go to work, the number of adults left in the home who might care for the child has been decreasing in two ways. First, those families that contain other adult relatives besides the parents are gradually shrinking and disappearing. Shrinkage and disappearance are even more pronounced in the so-called nuclear family consisting of mother, father and children. Today more than one in every six children under eighteen is living in a single-parent family, with one parent generally being the head of the family and holding down a job, usually full time. This single parent family is usually due to divorce, unwed mothers, young women postponing marriage but having children, and death etc. Research shows that these changes in family structure are occurring more rapidly among young families with small children. Also they are increasing with the degree of economic deprivation and urbanization, reaching their maximum among low income families living in the central core of our larger cities. This is not only true with the poor but the middle class families living in suburbia as well.

The authors reviewed the foregoing statistics on changing American families structures because in their view any responsible assessment of research and policy on day care must take into account the major changes that have been taking place in recent decades. As a first step, the authors examined the results of existing studies of day care. The results are discussed with reference to three major spears of development: cognitive, emotional, and social.

Cognitive development. Research with reference to intellectual development of children has been almost exclusively done with children enrolled in well-funded, high quality, university-based programs, often conducted with the specific goal of providing "cognitive enrichment". Program data suggest the following conclusions.

1. For children living in average, low-risk socio-economic circumstances, experience in programs that meet current federal and state regulations is unlikely to affect, either positively or negatively, the child's intellectual development as measured by standardized intelligence tests. Improving the quality of programs above current minimal standards does not appear to facilitate intellectual development for children from these backgrounds.

2. For children from higher risk environments, good quality day care may attenuate the declines in test scores freqently observed in youngsters from disadvantaged backgrounds.

3. The effects on the child's intellectual development of day care that is not of high quality remains unknown. The statement applies to all forms of care including center care, family day care, or care by someone other than a parent in the child's own home.

Emotional development. Investigations in this sphere have focused on the effect of day care on mother-child relationships. The limitation of such research is that it was conducted in laboratory and day care settings rather than in the home. The laboratory and day care setting are both anxiety-arousing milieu for both mother and child which enhances the mother-infant bond to be exacerbated under such circumstances. According to the authors, studies relative to emotional development and children's response to separation from mother have shown few differences. Nor is there any indication that such exposure decreases the child's preference for the mother versus an alternate caregiver. Findings are limited in their generality due to the unknown effects of poor quality day care on the mother-child bond, and whether day care influences mother-child attachment in the home.

Social development. Findings indicate that 1) The effects of day care on social development in children may be culture-bound and that mode of care is restricted to differences associated with center care versus either family day care or home care. 2) Compared to youngsters raised at home, children with day care experience interact more with their peers in both positive and negative types of behavior. These effects endure at least through the early years of elementary school. 3) Results of several studies suggest that exposure to center care, particularly in the early years "may slow acquisition of some adult cultural values". The relevant data indicate that children enrolled in day care for extended periods show higher levels of insecurity and dependency, increased aggression both toward peers and adults, and decreased cooperation and involvement in educational activities once the child enters school. 4) Such outcomes, however, do not appear to be characteristics of day care programs in other countries, nor of all centers studied in the United States. Rather, they seem to be products of certain kinds of program emphases more common in this nation than elsewhere and reflect the special character of children's peer groups in America, which are distinquished by a stress on automony, individualism, freedom of expression, competition, and permissiveness toward and encouragement of interpersonal aggression.

There are still many unresearched issues in day care that needs answering especially from the prospective of public policy. Therefore, the authors presented a list of recommendations for further research relative to issues in day care. Their suggestions include:

1. The content and impact of different types of day care, i.e., custodial vs developmental day care; part-time vs full-time care; center vs family day care vs care in the home; high quality vs poor quality.

2. The impact of day care on the child's behavior in other real-life settings i.e., the relationship of day care experiences on child's behavior and his later performance and behavior in school and society.

3. Socialization effects, i.e., whether day care affects the child's responsiveness to adults, his/her ability to use adults as resources, and the development of child's capacity to carry out responsibility and function effectively in different real-life situations.

4. The significance and effects of day care for parents, i.e., the extent at which day care influence: parents' perceptions of their own role as parents; parents' perceptions of expectation, toward and treatment of the child; parents performance on the job; parental careers, and parents' social life.

5. The significance and effect of day care on the family as a whole. Particular aspects include: a. The family's financial situation; b. The

family's social network (e.g., acquaintance with other families, patterns of mutual help and emotional support); c. The family's capacity to raise its other children, d. Family tension, conflict, and disruption (e.g., separation or divorce).

6. The differential significance and impact of day care for families living in different circumstances. For example, a. Low vs middle income families; b. Single vs two-parent families; c. Families with one vs two parents in the labor force; d. Families under stress (e.g., serious illness, physical handicap, inability to find work, etc.).

7. The impact of day care in and on a changing society. Some major issues include: a. The economic consequences of day care in enabling more women to enter the labor force; b. Consequences of day care for the family as a childrearing institution (for example, does day care as presently conducted and presented to the public contribute to abdication of the parental role?)

The authors concluded the report by stating some implications for policy relative to day care.

Policy Implications

The restricted focus of day care research is paralleled by an equally limited perspective on policy issues. Thus the questions raised by policy makers typically concentrate on the immediate impact of day care directly on the child, with little regard to effects on the family or the society at large. For example, the concerns usually expressed in discussions and documents dealing with day care policy tend to focus on such questions as the minimum age for entering a child into day care, or the specification of safety requirements and adult-child ratios. These are of course matters of importance, but they do not begin to address the range of policy issues requiring serious consideration. For example, they hardly speak to the primary concern of parents in seeking and selecting substitute care; namely, the availability of a well trained, dependable, warm and loving caregiver.

The full scope of relevant policy problems is ironically reflected in the outline of areas of needed scientific knowledge appearing in the preceding section. As we have argued throughout this document, the fact that such knowledge does not yet exist itself carries implications for public policy. Specifically, in the absence of reliable and valid information about the consequences of different types of care, we believe that government action in this field should be guided by the following general principles:

1. The types of services provided should be responsive to the expressed needs of the nation's parents as they perceive them.

2. Since perceived needs are likely to vary substantially for families in different circumstances, a wide range of options should be made available.

3. These available options should not be limited, as they presently are, to center care or family day care, and should be extended to include support for arrangements for care by relatives, friends, or even by members of the immediate family, including the parents.

4. In view of the extensive gaps in knowldge about the broader effects of day care, Federal research policies should be modified to give priority to scientific studies that go beyond the narrow scope of substance and method that now characterizes work in this area.

5. In the absence of objective data on the effects of different types of day care, the persons most appropriate and best qualified for evaluating available services are the child's own parents. In order to make such an evaluation, however, parents need information about the nature of the program, including an opportunity to observe it in operation. This principle should be implemented in public policy be requiring all child care services receiving Federal funding to provide parents with the information and opportunity necessary to make a knowledgeable assessment of the program. Specifically:

a. The program should be described in written materials and talks made available to the parents. Such descriptions should include some indication of objectives, activities, rules, discipline techniques, etc. This stipulation is analogous to the requirement of labeling imposed by the Food and Drug Administration.

b. Parents should be afforded repeated opportunities to visit, observe the program in operation, talk with caretakers, ask questions, and make suggestions.

6. To assist parents in making informed choices about substitute care, the Federal government should provide a handbook outlining areas of needed information, questions the parents should ask, etc.

7. To encourage the development of a wide range of services appropriate to the differing needs of families in different circumstances, the Federal government should keep to a minimum the specification of program criteria. Instead, groups of parents should be encouraged to develop plans for services that appear appropriate for meeting their needs. From this point of view, day care standards should be addressed not to the particular forms that child care services should take or the setting in which they are delivered, but rather to the process through which plans for such services are developed. For example, one might specify that the planning group include a majority of parents, at least one physician, one person from the lowest level of local government, a representative of the schools, etc. The actual form of care provided might vary from established modes of center care and family day care to cooperative arrangements, or even direct payment to permit parents to care for their own children at home.

8. The persons best qualified to monitor the quality of day care programs are the parents. Hence, opportunities must be available for parents to visit at any time, and to ask questions about the program. Where parental dissatisfactions cannot be resolved informally between parents and staff, grievance procedures should be established at the local level. The hearing board should consist of a majority of parents (excluding those affected), and be empowered to recommend withdrawal of Federal funds where programs fail to meet children's needs.

9. Finally, given the present forces in the society leading to the break up of families, it would be important to insure that forms of substitute care supported by the Federal governemnt do not contribute to the derogation or abdication of parental roles. For this reason, we recommend that all programs supported by the Federal government involving the care of children by someone other than parents be required to disseminate information and provide instructions making clear that day care can be an invaluable complement to but not a substitute for parents, who remain the most important influence in furthering the development of the child.

Part II of the paper presents the research documentation and analysis to the three major areas in which the research was conducted in Part I. A thorough or comprehensive review of research relative to cognitive, emotional and social development in young children was done with an accompanying bibliography to substantiate the findings in Part I.

STAFFING CHARACTERISTICS AND CHILD OUTCOMES

William J. Meyer, Ph. D., Professor of Psychology
Syracuse University

This position paper consists of 71 pages, including 4 pages of references. Topics include definitions of day care, methodological considerations, outcome measures, the concept of harm, parent child separation, deprivation as a form of harm, a summary of the potential for harm, the effects of child care staffs, family versus center-based programs, program philosophy, caregiver characteristics, and child characteristics. (January, 1977)

Statement of the problem

The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements)FIDCR) define a set of regulation that operators must satisfy in order to receive federal subsidies. Congress raised questions about the FIDCR because of the differences between the federal regulations and the states' licensing codes. A general feeling existed that there was little scientific evidence to justify many of the federal standards and requested that the FIDCR be re-evaluated.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the scientific literature relevant to the effects of child/staff ratios on children's development. Corollary to this objective, the paper attempted to identify domains of behaviors that might be influenced as a consequence of a day care experience. A pervasive concern throughout the paper was an effort to determine what is meant by harm; that is, when can we state with certainty that a child has been harmed as a consequence of a particular component of a program? In this report exclusive attention is given to staffing patterns in family-style and center-based programs. The discussion of harm focuses primarily on cognitive development and socialization, especially aggression. The methodological and social/political issues which limit the implications of the research are explored.

Objectives

The major questions addressed in this position paper are: (1) What are the major categories of behavioral outcomes resulting from day care that should be of concern to policy makers; (2) What is meant by harm, particularly psychological harm, and how can harm be assessed; (3) To what degree do variations in child/staff ratios influence behavioral outcomes (cause harm); and, (4) Evaluate the FIDCR in terms of staffing regulations as they relate to the quality of behavioral outcomes.

Methodology

The major work in producing this paper was reading the relevant research literature. Location of relevant papers (staff/child studies) became a major burden because so few exist and most of them are unpublished. In all likelihood, many useful papers were missed. ERIC documents were examined and the NTIS was used; these efforts had little or no pay off. Studies that were available, and of reasonable scientific quality, focused on institutional care not day care; a major limitation. Each available study was examined to determine the chronological age of subjects, number of subjects in each group, socio-economic status of the subjects, the organizational structure of the program (how children were assigned to caregivers), quality of caregivers (educational levels), and the general philosophy of the programs, including whether the programs were family-or center-based. In very rare instances it was also possible to describe the programs actually received by the children.

Major findings and recommendations

Several aspects of the report can be considered major findings and will be examined at first separately and then in terms of interactions.

Evaluation of research methodology

Essentially there are no firm research studies on the basis of which firm conclusions about child/staff ratios can be made. Studies employ very unique samples, use non-random assignment procedures without quasi-experimental analytic techniques, fail to describe essential program variables, use children as the unit of analysis rather than the group (to study teacher effects), use evaluation based on very short time spans (9 months), use difference scores without regard to either regression effects or the effects of pretesting on the outcome measures, and, made broad generalizations based on differences at the 10 percent level of significance. In effect, relevant sudies typically suffer from many of these defects and thus cannot be considered definitve studies.

The concept of harm

Much of the literature examining the antecedents of harm involves children reared from infancy in severely deprived environments (institutional or natural environment). As noted, these studies are not completely relevant to day care effects. The three major studies (Dennis' study of orphans adopted versus non-adopted children, Skeels' study of infants placed in an institution for mentally retarded, and Kagan's study of rural Indian babies) all indicate that long-term effects are minimal or even not apparent. All three investigators view their findings as showing that early deprivation effects can be ameliorated by a stimulating environment. In Kagan's study, the increased environmental stimulation occurred as the children were permitted to actively interact with the environment. Kagan is careful to note that the adult status of his subjects was commensurate with their peers; that is, he argues that adult outcomes (harm) are relative to specific cultures.

The general discussion of harm was mostly cast in the context of relative values. Thus, many researchers observe that children in center-based day care are more aggressive than children in family-style day care or who remain at home. These investigators suggest that the aggressiveness is a negative consequence of day care (most often day care infers mother-child separation). Studies of day care conducted 40 years ago, however, seemed to encourage aggression; socially acceptable aggression such as defending one's self from attack, speaking to adults, or maintaining property. Current authors fail to consider the positive aspects of aggression suggesting, to some degree, a change in values. That day care (mother-child separation) can be blamed for the observed aggression was seriously questioned. Studies were presented which clearly demonstrate that program variables (structure, space available, child/staff ratios) are the major contributors to variations in aggression as well as variations in performance on cognitive tasks.

A case was made that a formal educational component in day care was not necessary to prevent harm. A minimal program providing basically for the physical, social, and emotional requirements of children is an entirely defensible approach. The case was based on the fact that children can receive educational stimulation from their parents and siblings and that education in fact occurs without formal lessons. Data were presented showing that regardless of whether preschool children

received formal structured educational programs or not, differences between the groups which existed in the preschool disappear at the end of third grade. Children are very versatile and they will use any of numerous ways of acquiring whatever the environment presents to them.

Summarily, harm proved to be a rather elusive concept, especially when an effort to document its occurrence was made. Clearly, children can be harmed physically in innumerable ways, but psychological harm seems to require severe deprivation over extended (perhaps 5-10 years) periods of time before the consequences become irreversible.

Child/Staff Ratios

Studies directly addressing the effects of child/staff ratios on development, unconfounded by innumerable other variables, do not exist. Inferences regarding child/staff effects are possible, however, by examining the consistencies that occur over diverse studies (this strategy would be more valid if more studies existed). Since the child/staff findings are central to this paper, each major inference will be treated separately followed by a brief summary.

1. Low child/staff ratios (2/1, 3/1, or 4/1) tend to produce children who are quieter, less aggressive, and who perform well on standardized tests. This trend is clearly shown for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children.

2. The operationalizing of child/staff ratios may be as important as the actual ratio. For example, ratios of 20/10, 30/10, or 40/10 are equivalent to ratios of 2/1, 3/1, and 4/1. Data show, however, that these ratios are not psychologically equivalent. Specifically, when caregivers are assigned to small groups of children (2/1, 3/1, 4/1) the consequences are different than when assignments are not made and 10 caregivers are working with variable size groups which constantly change. Further, the evidence suggests that caregiver relationships should be stable from day to day. (Recently, Lucy Conboy communicated orally to me that children and caregivers, when allowed, tend to form natural clusters; caregiver and child characteristics interact to form relatively stable groupings. Perhaps small groupings should be allowed to form in this way).

The child/staff ratios necessary for good physical care of children, but without a formal educational program, can increase and thus reduce costs. Major increases for infant day care are not possible, but ratios as high as 12/1 for 5- and 6-year-olds have not proved harmful. Again, local capabilities and values should prevail in making these determinations.

Several variables that should influence child/staff ratios were examined including: child characteristics (in addition to chronological age); setting (family-style vs. center-based); program philosophy; caregiver characteristics; and, requirements for minimum and maximum programs.

There are two especially important issues in these sections: (1) where family-style programs include older children, it is possible to use these children as caregivers themselves (similar to Skeels' procedure); and, (2) there are unresolved questions about the levels of professionalism of caregivers. Caregivers in the family-style programs should be encouraged to receive training using any one of several available parent-training programs. These caregivers should also be given incentives to maintain their programs; again, children require stable relationships. No recommendations were made about the nature of effective incentives, but money, or free materials and toys, might be feasible.

Recommendations to modify the FIDCR regulations regarding staffing focused primarily on a perceived need to make them more flexible and realistic. The major recommended change was to clearly specify that child/staff ratios represent the actual number of children working with a caregiver rather than an overall ratio of all children to all caregivers. For example, a ratio of 5/1 means five children working with a single, and relatively constant, caregiver. A ratio of 50/10 also is a 5/1 ratio, but is does not define the working or operational group. Thus, in a 50/10 plan a few children will receive considerable care and some children will receive none. The size of the actual ratio can vary considerably depending upon children's age, the physical setting, and program philosophy. But, if the ratio is to have maning, it seems necessary to define it in terms of actual caregiver/child contact rather than an abstraction derived from the number of caregivers and children.

CONCEPT PAPER ON THE EFFECTS OF PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT ON DAY CARE

by
Elizabeth Prescott
Thomas G. David
Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, Calif.

The main body of the report contains 144 pages and 9 pages of bibliography. The seven sections include introduction, indoor space, outdoor areas, play equipment, organization and program, contextual constraints and recommendations for FIDCR. (July, 1976)

Basic Purpose Of The Paper Is To:

A. Describe the dimensions of the physical environment which might affect the well-being of infants, preschool and school age children in group and family day care,

B. Present current practices and recommendations,

C. Examine evidence concerning possible effects of these practices and,

D. Consider the usefulness of FIDCR regulations as a means to control the physical environment in day care.

The authors' concern is focused not on health or safety issues but with 'well-being' as it relates to opportunities for children to develop a sense of mastery, competence, increasing social and cognitive skills, and positive self-concept. Technical aspects of safety issues are not examined in the paper, but rather the authors focus on the effects of the physical environment upon the behavior of the children and of the adults who care for them. The authors hope to demonstrate not only that which will prevent undesirable consequences, but also that which will enhance the "quality of life" for children in day care.

Basic Design Features

Indoor Space

Design can be considered as strictly functional or guided by "more general human principles." The concept of archtypal places as proposed by Spwack links the provision of those places to, fulfill basic human needs to each level of human development.

If an institution denies access to these places for a long period of time, it induces "setting deprivation" and creates an overload of function in a limited setting. Those archtypal places presented include; shelter, play, groom, feed, excrete, store, territory, play, route, meet, complete, work,. . These are presented as an outline goal for planning day care space.

Acoustics:

Children are shown by research to long for "Quiet" and "no one bothering me", yet noise levels are seldom considered in state licensing codes. The authors present data on acceptable noise levels, on types of noise, (high pitched is more fatiguing) intermittent or irregular noises are more annoying, extreme quiet not provide an appropriate environment for many learning activities.

Suggestions for managing noise include; careful site selection, selecting of sound absorbent materials, class room arrangements to control traffic patterns, and to zone activities, and sufficient space per child to disperse the sound. There was one citation of data which showed that adults were more bothered by noise than were children.

Density:

There are two factors to consider in the allocation of floor space for children. Although it is considered vital that sufficient space be allowed for a feeling of openness and for active play, it is important that a room not be so large that the children feel lost or threatened. One finding based on several studies was that increased density leads to increased interaction but also to increased aggression (especially with boys), except that highly increased density in some cases led to more solitary than group behavior, perhaps in an attempt to escape from the overcrowded situation.

The optimum day care environment was considered to be one of low density and high resources. Under this condition was found the highest relevant participation and constructive behavior. If high density is unavoidable the authors suggest increasing the amount and quality of resources to provide activity options.

Climate Control:

Regional differences in climate make any standard difficult to define however, there are certain principles which may be expressed. Heating and mechanical equipment must meet certain performance and safety standards. Air circulation and maximum and minimum permissible temperatures can be specified.

Ventilation must be adequate, without drafts, and provided in such a manner as to provide protection from falls from open windows, and screening for protection from insects. (However, such screening must be removable in case of fire or other disaster.)

Because of the small size of the children and their special love of playing on the floor, heating and cooling must be especially directed toward providing comfort at and just above the floor level.

Lighting:

Licensing standards frequently do not mention lighting. Two problems are most frequent with lighting, one is a tendency to light everything with a high intensity, and the other is to let the lighting dictate where the children's activities shall take place.

Lighting can be natural or artificial with little apparent difference in visual performance. However, there is a possibility of sensory deprivation in windowless environment. A building with windows offers numerous possibilities for varying experiences for children as well as more varied lighting possibilities through the use of curtains and blinds.

Flooring:

Specifications for flooring are simple in most licensing requirements, being limited to dealing with safety and maintenance conditions. Areas to be considered include; not highly slippery; easily cleaned; pleasant to the touch; free of drafts; quiet; resilient to minimize accidents; designed with a minimum of change of level along major circulation paths; not retentive of static electricity, if carpeted. The fact that children spend much of their time in activities which necessitate their being on the floor, leads the authors to state that the floor "is a powerful organizer of traffic patterns" and that both indoors and out, variations in the surface lead to better organization.

Color:

There are many competing opinions but little hard evidence in the use of color. Color can be used to organize and delineate activity areas. Smaller objects which are to be manipulated may be more strongly colored, while more neutral colors are advised for large surfaces.

Wall Surfaces:

Most legal requirements specify wall surfaces which are clean and free of toxic substances. The use of different materials and textures can lead to tactile and visual stimulation. Walls are thought of primarily as means of defining limits of rooms but their utility can be much enhanced by imaginative use of materials which offer variety as well as durability and easy to clean surfaces.

Doors:

There are several considerations to be aware of when selecting doors for day care centers. Most fire codes specify doors which are hinged to open out, in addition, doors should not be too heavy for children to open independently. (Some of the codes specify hardware too heavy for children.) Some centers which open into streets with heavy traffic face a real conflict between the need to protect children by confining them to the day care area, and the equally important need to evacuate them rapidly in the event of fire or other disaster. The small child's fascination with doors can be partly satisfied by installing inexpensive doors and/or gates in doll corners or in outdoor play areas.

Furniture:

Licensing requirements usually specify child sized furniture with most emphasis upon chairs and tables. There should be a variety of shapes and textures. Usually infant areas are dominated by cribs, but they should contain other home type furniture such as upholstered chairs and rockers. There should be ample space for walking and crawling as well as a variety of things to look at and to reach for.

School aged children appreciate couches and upholstered chairs, and soft rugs after a day on hard furniture. Children do not always want child sized furniture. Sometimes being taller compensates for sitting on a chair from which one's legs dangle. It is important that furniture be light weight and varied in order that it can be moved and arranged in response to different needs.

Storage:

While seldom required except by a statement "that materials be accessible to children" storage deserves more attention as a key factor in providing good day care. Adequate storage helps to guarantee (1) enough supplies for a good program, (2) safe places to keep things which should not be accessible to children, and (3) basic order.

Adult Places:

Except for specifying an adult toilet and sometimes a lounge for

staff, little thought has been given to the comfort of the adult in the center. Adults spend little time in the lounge, they need comfort where the action is with the children. Child sized chairs are not comfortable for adults. An easy chair puts the adults eye on a level with that of the child, it provides a safe place for the troubled child to snuggle when the adult is with the group, and it provides a comfortable seat while a child is held for individual attention. Adults also need places for storage of things children should not have access to. Desks take up much room needed by children and tend to separate the children from the teacher, cupboards seem to provide the best storage space.

Bathrooms:

All licensing departments specify the number of toilets required, but the ratios vary from one toilet/basin to 7/8 children to one toilet/basin for 20 children. According the The Child Welfare League of America, more important considerations include (1) every group regardless of size should have two toilets and wash basins, (2) toilets and washbasins should be directly accessible both to playroom and outdoor space, (3) toilet and wash basins should be permanently secured and should be of proper size and height, (4) separate facilities should not be required for children under six years of age, (5) each child should have his own towel and washcloth, and if they are not disposable, they should be kept in sanitary condition and hung at child height with sufficient space to prevent their touching others, (6) water used by children should have automatic temperature controls to keep the temperature from rising above 120 degrees.

Sleeping Areas:

Most codes require that a rest period be provided for all children. Usually cots are required for older children and cribs are specified for infants. Although there are recommendations that lighting be modified and that separate areas for sleeping be provided, research has found that an open environment did not adversely affect the sleep of either infants or toddlers. (Although 80% of the staff preferred a separate room for sleeping.)

There is a strong feeling by many people that cots are clearly preferable to mats. The observations of the authors were that children rest equally well on either and they cite no study indication that cots are healthier or more sanitary.

Kitchens:

Usually, child day care centers are expected to comply with state health department requirements for food handling. The authors feel that it is important to differentiate between the requirements of a small day care center and those established for large commercial restaurants. Food and the people who prepare it have special meaning to children and there should be some means provided to maintain contact between the preparing and the eating of the food.

Other Indoor Spaces:

An **Isolation Room** is required by most codes. There are conflicting opinions on the need since other children are usually exposed to an illness before the child develops symptoms.

Cubbies are important assets to the center because they offer a means of providing personal storage, privacy, and individual territory in a setting where most things must be shared.

Entry areas are useful in helping the child make the transition from outside and home to inside and center. They should not serve to isolate the parent so that he cannot see what goes on in the play areas.

The Shape of the Indoor Play Area should preferably be other than square since the standard practice of organizing interest areas is around the perimeters of the room leaving "dead" space in the center of the room where the children bog down. Square areas probably should be developed from the center outward.

Basic Design Features-The Outdoor Environment:

The majority of states require a period of outdoor play each day not only because it is important for the child's health but because it is an integral part of the child's learning experiences.

Location of outdoor play area should be such that it is directly accessible.

Noise level should be controlled both for effect on those groups inside, and for effect of traffic arteries and other environmental polluters.

Climate control should be considered, and both shade and sun should be available during all parts of the year.

Ground Cover should consist of a variety of surfaces; the recommendation is made that grass, sand, and asphalt combined makes for a good overall organization of surfaces.

Fences are important protection for the children. They should be of sufficient height to discourage leaping or handling. An ideal fence should have both "see through" and "non-see through" areas.

Outside Storage Areas enhance the use of the play space.

Plumbing and Electrical Outlets should be provided.

Permanent Equipment should be installed in a safe manner and ongoing maintenance should be properly performed.

Play Equipment:

There is no major argument about the desirability of keeping children interested and involved. The provision of a rich environment increases the comfort and emotional well-being of adults responsible for their care because happy children are easier to live with.

Goals for children in day care include (1) cognitive gains, (2) social interaction, (3) talkativeness, (4) glee, (5) mobility, and (6) autonomy. The use of ample and varied play equipment does much to assure that the goals are met. In addition sufficient equipment contributes toward a more pleasant atmosphere. Research has shown that the majority of quarrels are over possessions.

Questions of Safety:

Safety is always an issue in child care. Some center operators try to assure safety by making many and restrictive rules. The result of such an approach is that strictly forbidden activities will be done while aduts are not around. It is essential to build safe design features but stifling to prohibit experimentation. Opportunities to test limits and to experiment are most important for school aged children.

Questions of Organization and Program:

Although the foregoing has discussed topics as if they were separate and independent, this is, of course, not true. The parts are interrelated and must come together in a way that creates a program which is comfortable for children and adults.

Dimensions of such a program include (1) controlled access to stimuli, (2) flexibility, (3) pathways to prevent unnecessary chaos and unde-

sirable intrusions, (4) privacy, and (5) softness.

Softness. There is another dimension which we have found to be predictive of much that happens in a day care program and that is the dimension of "softness". The softness rating was so named because it appeared to indicate the responsiveness of the environment to the child especially on a sensual-tactile level. It was based on the presence or absence of eleven components:

(1) malleable materials such as play dough;
(2) sand which children can be in, either a box or area;
(3) "laps", teachers holding children;
(4) single sling swings;
(5) grass which children can be on;
(6) large rug or full carpeting indoors;
(7) water as an activity;
(8) very messy materials such as finger paint, clay, mud;
(9) child/adult cozy furniture: rockers, couches, lawn swings, etc.;
(10) dirt to dig in;
(11) animals which can be held such as guinea pigs, dogs, cats, etc.

The presence of softness tends to be associated with opportunities for privacy. The softness indicators appear to be an expression of adult willingness to let the environment be children's wishes and needs. Programs which are designed to give few choices to children seldom have high softness ratings.

Recommendations

The table which follows summarizes the authors judgment about design features which are important and ways in which good practice might best be implemented. In making these recommendations they do not propose standards for health, building or fire safety. They assume that there are general requirements for cleanliness and that technical inspections of fire and building safety will occur.

Indoor Design

Indoor acoustics: Provide start up costs for installation of carpeting and possible sound absorbing ceiling materials, especially where square feet per child approaches minimum.

Climate control: Give thought to setting limits on maximum and minimum temperatures permitted.

Lighting: None or local regulations; provide information on good practice and energy efficiency.

Flooring: Encourage some use of carpet, provide technical assistance on maintenance.

Color: No recommendation. Provide information on color as a way providing clarity and definition in space.

Doors: Provide realistic guidelines for requirement of crash bars.

Walls: Must be washable.

Furniture: Require comfortable furniture for adults, encourage use of couches, armchairs and other soft, cozy furniture.

Storage: Require adequate storage with some storage accessible to children.

Adult Places: Encourage concern for adult comfort.

Bathrooms: Provide technical assistance on good bathroom design. See if there is a data base for number of toilets required. Include a statement on toileting for infant-toddlers and school age children.

Sleeping Areas: Require provision for nap time. Encourage provision of privacy and options for children who do not sleep.

Kitchens: Encourage design where children can have safe controlled access to kitchen or some contact with food preparation.

Density/Square Feet per Child

The provision of adequate amounts of space appears to be important in controlling noise, providing necessary privacy and in preventing discomfort and irritation for both children and adults which stems from hours of confinement in small spaces. Also FIDCR programs must accommodate more adults than most day care now regulated by licensing requirements. We recommend that all programs under FIDCR regulations which provide 6 or more hours of care should have a minimum of 40-42 square feet per child.

Outdoor Design

Location of Outdoor Play Area: Wherever possible indoor rooms should open into outdoor play areas.

Noise Level: This is a problem that requires more attention. Are there data on air and noise pollution surrounding centers in industrialized or heavily urban areas?

Climate Control: Adequate shade should be required to provide for outdoor comfort in warm weather.

Ground Cover: Technical help should be provided to encourage centers to diversify their ground cover. Exclusively asphalt yards should be discouraged. Special consideration should be given to ground cover in infant-toodler programs.

Fencing: Adequate fencing should be required with exceptions permissable. (Example of exceptions: program for school age children in a spacious rural area, family day care serving school age children.)

Outside Storage: To be recommended and considered as a legitimate expense in developing an outdoor area.

Plumbing and Electrical Outlets: Recommended and to be considered a legitimate expense.

Access Conditions: Recommend to consider in developing plans.

Play Equipment

Recommend technical assistance to centers in evaluating the adequacy of play equipment for meeting children's needs.

Safety

We feel that concerns for safety may be overemphasized and sometimes misguided. We strongly recommend that information be obtained which makes it possible to determine the types and frequency, by age, of accidents that actually do occur in centers and family day care as compared to accidents in home settings.

Privacy

Retain requirement that opportunities for privacy shall be provided.

Size of Facility

Recommend great caution in establishing facilities which care for more than 75 children. More data are needed here.

Size of Group

We see no evidence that group size is being effectively regulated -- or should be. We recommend obtaining some data here and possibly deleting the current regulations. Variability in social grouping throughout the day should be encouraged.

SUMMARIES OF THE STATE-OF-THE-ART POSITION PAPERS ON DAY CARE

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Legal Aspects of Federal Standards
G.G. Morgan 1

Alternatives to FIDCR: The Feasibility of State Standards for Certification of Federally-Supported Day Care
R. R. Rowe 4

History of FIDCR
S. P. Cooper 6

Enforcement of Standards: With Reference to Revocation
N.E. Class and R. C. Gerhart 8

Child Care Needs and Improved Approaches to Standard Settings and Enforcement
L. B. Costin, M. D. Keyserling, W. L. Pierce, and W. Wadlington 10

Licensing, Standards, and Regulations in Child Care in Europe, Canada and Israel
S. B. Kamerman 13

Federal Standards: Rationale and Recommendations
D. Cohen and E. Zigler 15

Multigenerational Day Care
P. Kerschner and P. Harris 16

Effects of Day Care on Preschoolers and Provision of Support Services for Day Care Families
C. M. Heinicke and L. M. Strassmann 18

The Relationship of Staffing Characteristics to Child Outcomes
U. J. Oyemade and M. Chargois 20

Effect on Children of Organization and Design of Day Care Physical Environment
C. Kruvant and G. Redish 21

Infant Day Care and the Family: Strategies to Ensure Parent Participation
G. G. Fein 22

The Child Care Market: A Review of Evidence and Implications for Federal Policy
C. R. Hill 24

The Effect of Day Care on the Infant
J. Kagan 26

The Concept Paper on Health and Safety Issues in Day Care
P. Pizzo and S. S. Aronson 23

Effects of Infant Day Care Experience on Behavior and Development
H. N. Ricciuti 28

The Evaluation of Existing FIDCR - Day Care for School-Age Child
J. M. Bergstrom and D. L. Dreher 28

Day Care in Context: An Ecological Perspective on Research and Public Policy
U. Bronfenbrenner, J. Belsky and L. Steinberg 30

Staffing Characteristics and Child Outcomes
W. J. Meyer 32

Concept Paper on the Effects of Physical Environment on Day Care
E. Prescott and T. G. David 33